

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XV.—No. 57.

JANUARY, 1939.

## THE RECLUSE

### A LOLLARD INTERPOLATED VERSION OF THE *ANCREN RIWLE*

By ERIC COLLEDGE

It is well known that the Lollards, as part of their propaganda, interpolated texts of orthodox works of religious instruction with passages expounding their doctrine. Miss Hope Emily Allen, in her *Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle*,<sup>1</sup> has elaborated Miss Dorothy Everett's classification of the extant MSS. of Rolle's *English Prose Psalter*,<sup>2</sup> showing that three separate interpolated texts of this work, at least two of them interpolated with undoubtedly Lollard doctrine, circulated during the fifteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere in Miss Allen's work we shall find references to two similar interpolated texts, the Lollard versions of Gaytring's *Catechism*<sup>4</sup> and of *The Prick of Conscience*.<sup>5</sup> In view of Miss Allen's recent work upon the *Ancren Riwele*, where she has been able to show how widely this manual circulated during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and how many writers borrowed from it,<sup>6</sup> it is of special significance to find a Lollard interpolated version of the *Ancren*

<sup>1</sup> New York and London, 1927 : I shall cite this work as "Rolle".

<sup>2</sup> *Modern Language Review*, xvii and xviii.

<sup>3</sup> *Rolle*, pp. 173 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 190-1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 387-94.

<sup>6</sup> *Modern Language Review*, xxviii, etc., and *Times Literary Supplement*, October 24, 1936, etc.

*Riwele*, similar in aim and scope to the interpolated texts mentioned; this is the work known as *The Recluse*,<sup>1</sup> contained in MS. Pepys 2498, Magdalene College, Cambridge, a MS. of the late fourteenth century.

*The Recluse* is "an adaptation or paraphrase rather than a copy of the original text. . . . In many places the text is so much altered, or so corrupt, as to be almost unrecognizable, and there is much omission, especially in the seventh and eighth parts."<sup>2</sup>

Macaulay has shown that, of the extant MSS. of the *Ancren Riwele*, B, V, and *The Recluse* do, to some extent, form one group, both with regard to variant readings and interpolations. Since, unfortunately, he has only cited V and *The Recluse* occasionally, his collation only indicates the common relation of the three MSS. to the original text, and not their interrelations; but it appears, from a cursory inspection, more probable that they have a common source than that *The Recluse* is derived either from B or V.

All three agree in the variants of Morton's text, pp. 4, 8, and 64.24: but the long omission in B and V

3e, mine leoue sustren . . . leste þe uttre uondunge kundlie þe inre<sup>3</sup>

is partially supplied in *The Recluse*, which has

Popule meus qui te beatificant illi te decipiunt ¶ Þis is goddes word þorouȝ ysaie . who þat praiseþ ȝou tofore ȝou and seiþ wel is þe moder þat þe bare and to goderhele were þou borne in þis werlde . þise ben þine traytours seiþ oure lorde,<sup>4</sup>

which corresponds with Morton 194.2-5. In the case of many variant readings, it appears as though *The Recluse* does not copy the emendations or defective readings common to B and V, but supplies its own emendation (very often using a defective text). The best example of this occurs in the case where Nero reads:

Þeos eoden into ancre huse ase dude Saul into hole: nout ase Dauid þe gode. Boðe þauh heo wenden into hole, Saul & Dauid, ase hit telleð ine Regum. Auh Dauid wende þider in vorte don his fulðe þerinne . . .<sup>5</sup>

In the text as printed by Morton, the omission has been supplied from the Cotton MS.:

<sup>1</sup> Edited J. Pahlsson, Lund, 1911: reprinted with notes, 1918.

<sup>2</sup> G. C. Macaulay, *Modern Language Review*, ix. 147.

<sup>3</sup> Morton 192.11-194.12.

<sup>4</sup> P. 91.

<sup>5</sup> Morton 128.

Auh Daud wende *in him for to clensen* : ach Saul wende pider in vorte don his fulðe . . .

According to Macaulay's collation, at this point B (and T) agree with C, but the reading in *The Recluse*,

swich men wenden in to Hole as kyng saule dude . He went pider in forto make foule þere jnne . And so done hij þat taken holy lyf forto filen it . For Saul went forto seche Daud forto haue slayn hym . And Daud went in to hole forto hyden hym fram hym . as it telleþ in Libro Regum,<sup>1</sup>

which gives a different turn to the narrative from that of the emended original text, suggests that the compiler of *The Recluse* was confronted with a corrupt text such as Nero, and was forced to make the best sense of it that he could, having recourse to the Vulgate narrative to do so.<sup>2</sup>

*The Recluse* has, however, in the main (so far as it and the *Ancren Riwle* do correspond) the same characteristics as B and V. Macaulay has shown that they all have the interpolated passages beginning at Morton 198.9, 198.30, 200.27, and 202.2. We may notice here that B and V have in common interpolated passages beginning at Morton 108.7 and 200.23 which are not in *The Recluse*, and that the interpolated passages beginning at Morton 42.30, 64.8, 68.2, 206.19, 254.29, 256.7, 262.4, 420.1, 420.16, 424.2, and 430.10 are peculiar to B.

*The Recluse* is, approximately, a quarter to a third shorter than Morton's text ; and, since much of *The Recluse* consists in its own peculiar interpolations, it will be seen that the original has been much abbreviated. The chief omissions, as Macaulay points out, occur in the seventh and eighth parts. Elsewhere, the method by which the omissions are made is, in almost all cases, the same. The reviser has taken the first Scriptural or patristic citation in each paragraph of the original, and has placed it first (very often supplying the Latin original or an English translation, if either has been omitted) and has then given a shortened version of the paragraph. Usually he omits whole sentences or clauses, and retains others *in extenso*, rather than relying upon his ability to produce a running précis of the whole.

It may be that the work as we have it here represents a first

<sup>1</sup> P. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Similar independent emendations of *The Recluse* are to be found in the passages corresponding with Morton 6.14, 28.7, 34.15, 66.13, 66.14, and 78.28.

draft, produced in haste and never revised, since there are many marks of careless workmanship. Very often, when the reviser has transposed a passage to an earlier place in a paragraph, he repeats it, this time quite superfluously, in its original context. For example :

And an holy man fram fer seiȝ hou þat oure lefdy com a doun fram heuene & tweie maidens wiȝ hir & þat on bare as it ware a box wiȝ lete-warie wiȝ a styk of gold & putt in þat ones mouȝe of þis lete-warie . And þe maiden zede to hym þat lay a midde . nay quop oure lefdy he is his owen leche . goo ouer to þe þrid . An holy man stode & bihelde al þis . . .<sup>1</sup>,

the corresponding passage being in Morton 370. Many other similar repetitions will be found.

The MS. is full of errors : many of them may be due to mere scribal carelessness<sup>2</sup> ; but some at least of them are inherent. Thus in the middle of an interpolated passage we find

Þere ben two manere of wymmen þat ben trewe prelates and prechoures,<sup>3</sup>

where the reviser is adapting to his own needs

þer beoð two dolen to two manere of men þet beoð of religiun. To eiȝer limpeð his dole, ase ȝe muwen iheren. Gode religiuse beoð i þe worlde, summe nomeliche prelaȝ & treowe prechures<sup>4</sup>

and has evidently written "wymmen" where the sense even of the revision requires "men."<sup>5</sup> Similarly, in place of the correct

Invenit servus tuus cor suum<sup>6</sup>

*The Recluse* has

inuenit seruus cor meum,

which is translated as

ich haue yfounde myne hert my seruant<sup>7</sup>,

and again, in place of

Bonarum mentium est culpam agnoscere<sup>8</sup>

*The Recluse* has

Bonorum meritum . . .

<sup>1</sup> P. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Jordan observes this in his notice of Pahlsson's 1911 text : *Englische Studien*, LI. 255.

<sup>3</sup> P. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Morton 10.

<sup>5</sup> The reviser may have been led astray by attributing the meaning "nun" to the word "religiuse" in the original.

<sup>6</sup> Morton 48.

<sup>7</sup> P. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Morton 336.



which is translated as

Goode it is to ben aknowen of þe lowe man of hert gylt.<sup>1</sup>

None the less, it is evident that the reviser had access at least to a compilation of patristic writings,<sup>2</sup> that he was well acquainted with the Vulgate text, and that he was accustomed to translate it.

The direct quotations from or references to the Vulgate text which are interpolated are too numerous to enumerate. Of course, the reviser shows his acquaintance with the usual Lollard tags. Thus we may compare :

Losengerye is þre fold . Þe first is yuel . Þe oþer is wers and þe þridde alderwerst .

Ve illis qui ponunt pul[ul]illos &c . Ve illis qui dicunt bonum malum . & malum bonum ponentes lucem tenebras . & tenebras lucem . hoc . de . detractoribus & adulatoribus conuenit ¶ Þe first is . zif man is goode prayse hym bifore hym & make hym better þan he is . And zif he doþe wel oþer seiþ . heueþ hym vp wiþ praysynge biforne hym. Þis man god acurseþ . . .<sup>3</sup>

with one of the Lollard interpolations from *The Prick of Conscience* :

For þei wene þat vices were vertues  
But many men hier disceiued is .  
And sain also þat vertu is vijs  
Therfore þei perisch in her folijs  
God curseþ hem ful bitturly  
Þurghg þe prophete isay .  
Ve vobis qui dicitis . bonum malum & malum  
bonum ponentes tenebras lucem & lucem tenebras  
dulce <in> amarum & amarum dulce ve enim in sacra  
scriptura ubi ponitur significat eternam dampnacionem  
And þis cursing is more to witte  
Than bischopus or popes for god zeueþ hit  
Ther off schaal non assoilled be  
Til he serue vertu and vices fle.<sup>4</sup>

In some places, however, the Vulgate has been used to the considerable improvement of the original. To the "Vigilate . . ." of Morton's text is added "Media nocte . . ." and a reference to

<sup>1</sup> P. 158.

<sup>2</sup> Such additional patristic citations occur on pp. 4, 21, 37, 62, etc.

<sup>3</sup> P. 37; cf. Morton 86.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Rylands English 90, f. 3<sup>r</sup>. Compare especially Wycliffe's *Vae Octuplex*, an exposition of Matt. xxiii, printed by Arnold, *Select English Works*, London, 1871, II. 379 *et seq.*

yet another injunction of Christ concerning watching <sup>1</sup>: the original reference to the story of the Pharisee and the publican is expanded <sup>2</sup>; and the story of Samson and the foxes is given in its entirety.<sup>3</sup> This last we may compare with the Lollard *Reply of Jack Upland* (A.D. 1401):

loke how Sampson bonde the foxes  
two and two togedir,  
til that thei destried  
the corne alle about hem,  
and this was, as a doctour saith,  
the figur of freres.<sup>4</sup>

It is also evident that the reviser was well acquainted with the general contents of the original before he began his work. In many places he has transposed passages, some of them only short phrases, others lengthy paragraphs: and it is of importance to observe that most of these transposed passages are placed in a context earlier than in the original, thus excluding the possibility that they first came to the reviser's notice only when he was working through the original text.

Examples of such transpositions are

<i>The Recluse</i> 5.14-16 derived from Morton 224.5-6	
20.22-26	350-354
21.6	318.6-8
40.7-12	392.13-16, 398.11-15
49.29	238
64.10-18	176
81.29	204
92.19-20	190
111.3-15	414-416
139.23-29	378-380.

On remedies against covetousness, lechery, and gluttony the reviser has formed an elaborate compilation, thus:

<i>The Recluse</i> 11.9-14 derived from Morton 258-260	
11.15-17	294
11.23-28	260-262
11.31-33	342. <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 65. The corresponding passage is in Morton 114.

<sup>2</sup> P. 152; Morton 328.

<sup>3</sup> P. 125; Morton 254.

<sup>4</sup> *Political Poems*, ed. T. Wright, *Chronicles and Memorials* 1859- , II. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Such compilations were popular in fourteenth-century devotional literature, thus *A Talking of pe Loue of God* (printed Horstmann, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*.

Occasionally the reviser has developed a new theme from elements already present in the original. Two passages,

Men seþ whan þe fader wil do þe moder bete hir childe sche wil bidde þe childe crie & bete it on þe cloþes . þan may we say þat god loueþ vs as þe moder doþe þe childe þat beteþ on his cloþes whan he beteþ vs here vpon oure bodyes & nouȝth opon oure naked soule . take we þan his betynge louelich,<sup>1</sup>

and

Now by þis worde . bot ȝif a man wepe als mychel for his synnes as þe wyf doþe for hir childe for sche leteþ teres wiþouten mesure and bot ȝif a man dude so for his synnes he nere nouȝth verray repentaunt<sup>2</sup>

are obviously inspired by those in the original where the author tells how a mother will allow her child to believe that it is lost,<sup>3</sup> how men will beat the thing against which a child has hurt itself,<sup>4</sup> and how a mother will intervene between her child and its father.<sup>5</sup> Similar "mother and child" figures are to be found in the writings of Wycliffe himself,<sup>6</sup> and in the popular *Revelations* of St. Birgitta.<sup>7</sup> A line of enquiry which might be fruitful, but which I have not been able to pursue, might establish relations between *The Recluse* and the contemporary *Chastising of God's Children*, which derives alike its inspiration, its title, and the whole of its first chapter from the portions of the *Ancren Riwle* just cited.<sup>8</sup>

Occasionally the reviser transposes a passage and adapts it to suit his argument, when that is precisely contrary to that of the original. He reproduces and expands

Marie & Marthe, boðe heo weren sustren : auh hore lif sundrede. Ȝe ancren habbeð i-numen ou to Marie dole, þet ure Louerd sulf herede. "Maria optimam partem elegit." "Marthe, Marthe," cweð he, "þu

London, 1895, II. 345 *et seq.*) is derived from Rolle's *Meditatio de Passione Domini*, *On Ureisin of oure Louerd*, and *Pe Wohunge of Ure Louerd*, as is pointed out by Miss R. J. Peebles, *The Legend of Longinus*, Bryn Mawr College Monographs, 1911, pp. 85-6.

<sup>1</sup> P. 95.

<sup>2</sup> P. 144.

<sup>3</sup> Morton 230.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 186.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 366.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Mathew: *Unpublished English Works of Wycliffe* (E.E.T.S., 1880), p. 59, Arnold III. 196-8, and Workman, *John Wyclif*, Oxford, 1926, II. 45.

<sup>7</sup> Cumming: *The Revelations of St. Birgitta* (E.E.T.S., 1928), p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> *The Chastising of God's Children* was printed by Caxton. Among the extant MSS. are B.M. Harleian 6615, Trinity College Cambridge 305, and Magdalen College Cambridge Pepys 2125.

ert ine muchele baret. Marie haueð i-chosen betere, and ne schal hire noðing binimen hire dole" <sup>1</sup>

as

And þan chese 3e þe better part as god hym self seiþ þat þe maudeleyn dude . Sche ne pouzth on kyn ne on none erþelich goode bot onelich on hym . And martha her suster was aboute erþelich þinges . and 3af al hire besynesse forto serue pouere men . And whan sche blamed marie hire suster for sche sett hire doune att jesu cristes feete to heren hym speke and nolde helpe hire suster forto digtten her alder mete . And martha blamed hire . Jesus crist Ansuered for hire and seide . martha . martha þus þat sche haþ chosen þe better pa(r)t and it ne schulde nouzth be bynomen hire,<sup>2</sup>

but the passage which follows in *The Recluse* praises the vocation of Martha, that is of the active life as opposed to the contemplative.

It is probable that the last section as we have it <sup>3</sup> is the work of another hand. As has already been said, the chief omissions made by the reviser are of the seventh and eighth sections of the *Ancren Riwe* ; reference to the list of transpositions given above will show that the greater part of these sections had already been utilized : and the probability is that the work of the first reviser ends with the words

Þis is þe riȝth loue þat reuleþ þe hert wiþinnen þat euere owe to ben in worschippe ykept // Þis is þe seuenþe dele of þis book.<sup>4</sup>

Whether the reviser wrote a concluding section to follow this, now lost, or whether the work was left by him in this presumably unfinished condition we cannot know ; but it seems that the want of a suitable concluding section was felt by a scribe, who added what now follows in the MS. by way of remedying this deficiency. This final section is composed of portions of the seventh and eighth sections of the *Ancren Riwe*, used without regard for the fact that much of the matter appears earlier in *The Recluse*, of certain interpolations which are not in harmony with those of the first reviser, and of a version of the twenty-first chapter of the *Apocalypse*, with a commentary. This commentary <sup>5</sup> is derived from the ME. version of the Anglo-Norman *Apocalypse*, as the following collation of the

<sup>1</sup> Morton 414.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 29-30.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 193-201.

<sup>4</sup> P. 193.

<sup>5</sup> The translation of the verses themselves does not agree with the version in MS. Rylands 92 which I have consulted.

commentary on the first few verses in *The Recluse* with the corresponding text in Anglo-Norman and in MS. Rylands English 92 will show :

## AN. Apocalypse

Ceo que le angele mena  
S. Johan en un grant  
munt & haut pur veer  
le espouse al angniel  
signifie que cil qui, par  
la grace de Deu, sunt  
mene en hautesce de vie  
poent avoer conessance  
de (la) gloire que seinte  
Glise atent . La lumiere  
que resemble pierre pre-  
ciosa, come jasje &  
cristal, signifie la vertu  
de seinte Glise (est)  
ferme en verdur de foi &  
en nette de baptesme (&  
en clarte de eovre de con-  
fessiun . Li grant mur  
haut signifie Jhesu Crist  
qui tout garantist . Les  
.xij. portes signifient les  
.xij. apostles, les . xij.  
nuns escriz signifient les  
anciennes peres de la  
vieulz lei, patriarches &  
prophetes, qui profetie-  
rent avant ceo que li  
apostles preeschent<sup>1</sup>

## MS. Rylands 92

¶ Par þe aungil ledde  
seint ioun to þe greet hil  
& hiȝ for to se þe spouse  
of þe lombe : bitokeneþ  
hem þat þoruȝ þe grace  
of god . ben led in to hiȝ  
lijf . for to haue know-  
inge of þe blis þat holi  
chirche abidiþ aftir ¶ þe  
lijȝt þat semede as of a  
precious stoon iasper and  
cristall : bitokeneþ þat  
þe vertu of holi chirche .  
is confermed in þe  
vertu<sup>1</sup> of þe bileue/  
and in briȝtnes of þe  
clennes of baptyȝm and in  
briȝtnes of werkis of  
confessioun ¶ þe grete  
wallis and hiȝ bitokeneþ  
ihū crist þat kepith alle  
(¶) þe xij zatis : bito-  
keneþ þe xij apostlis  
¶ þe xij names writen :  
bitokeneþ þe xij patri-  
arkis of þe oold lawe . þe  
patriarkis & þe profetis  
þat proficieden or þe  
apostlis camen to preche<sup>2</sup>

## The Recluse

Þat þe Aungel ledde me  
seint john seiþ to þe  
grete mountayne & heiȝe  
forto see þe spouse of  
þe lombe bitokneþ hem  
þat ben þoruȝ þe grace  
of god in heiȝenesse of  
lyf mowen haue know-  
einge of þe glorie & of  
þe blisse of holi chirche .  
Þat lijȝt as of preciose  
stones of jasper & of cristal  
bitokneþ vertu of holi  
chirche þat is confermed  
in þe grenehed of þe  
bileue & in clenness of  
Baptesme & in hete of  
þe werk of schrift . þe  
gret heiȝe wal bitokneþ  
jesu crist þat to alle is  
keper . þe .xij. zates  
bitokneþ þe .xij. apostles  
& þe .xij. names writen  
bitokneþ þe .xij. olde  
faders of þe olde lawe  
patriarkes & prophetes  
þat prophecieden er þe  
apostles precheden<sup>4</sup>

The fact that another text of the ME. version of the Anglo-Norman Apocalypse is found preceding *The Recluse* in MS. Pepys 2498<sup>5</sup> makes it appear probable that the addition of this last section is to be attributed to the scribe who compiled the MS. in its present form. The last eighteen lines begin with the remarkable sentiment & eueryche weke ones redeþ þis book & it wil do ȝou good more þan ȝe badd ȝoure bedes . For in þis book ȝe mowe knowen ȝoure defautes wel better þan in biddynȝ,<sup>6</sup>

which is more extreme than anything in the foregoing chapters ; and the opening words of the concluding paragraphs,

Now to men & wymmen þat ben bischett,

<sup>1</sup> Presumably an erroneous copying of "verdure."

<sup>2</sup> *L'apocalypse en français*, ed. Meyer and Delisle, Société des anciens textes français, Paris, 1901, pp. 119-20.

<sup>3</sup> Ff. 42<sup>v</sup>-43<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> P. 194.

<sup>5</sup> F. 227 et seq. See Miss A. C. Paues (who is preparing a text of the first ME. version), *A 14th-Century English Biblical Version*, Cambridge, 1902.

<sup>6</sup> P. 200.

disregard the important qualification of the original text made by the reviser :

Vnderstonde þat wel vche man whan ich speke of onelich men oþer of Ancres . takeþ it on non oþer maner þan j speke it here . For als gret myster haþ o man come to blisse as anoþer.<sup>1</sup>

We may question whether the reviser, after having adapted the original so carefully to meet the needs of secular readers, would have called it " þis good book Recluse." <sup>2</sup> Again, the request for prayers with which this final section concludes is superfluous, since the reviser had already made such a request at the end of his first long interpolation, where he describes himself as " hym þat þis [*i.e.* the foregoing interpolation] ordeinde and made." <sup>3</sup> Finally, it might be supposed from the concluding sentence of this last section that the work in its present form had already gained sufficient popularity for it to be expected to have a considerable circulation in the future : the reference to those who " heard " the book must remind us of the common Lollard practice of reading books aloud in company.<sup>4</sup>

It is not surprising that in a work such as this we find the active life preferred to the contemplative.<sup>5</sup> Such a passage as this, extolling the merits of manual labour,

Lord seide seint Peter we han forsaken alle þinges and folowen þe . What forsook Peter bot an olde nett . nay it nys nouȝth al so in þe forsakyng of werldelich good . For hij wrouȝtten for her mete in þe werlde,<sup>6</sup>

is evidently a reflection of contemporary controversy, and may be paralleled from other Lollard writings :

And her seiþ Austeyn, in his book of warkis of monkis, þe apostil wrowt wiþ his handis þingis able to manniss vse honestly, as þe warkis of carpenteris han hem, werkis of sewars, and of feld telars, and like to þeis <sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 47.

<sup>2</sup> P. 201.

<sup>3</sup> P. 19. In several places the reviser indicates that the whole is not his own work : thus we read " Now forþ in oure matere þat we spake of bifore " (p. 49) and " Now go we aȝein to oure matier " (p. 99).

<sup>4</sup> See Miss Margaret Deanesly : *The Lollard Bible*, Cambridge, 1920, pp. 366-9.

<sup>5</sup> Wycliffe's tract, *Of Feigned Contemplative Life* (printed by Mathew), is the best-known work on this subject by a Lollard writer.

<sup>6</sup> P. 82.

<sup>7</sup> *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines*, edited by J. H. Todd, Camden Society, 1842, p. 106.

Me mervelith of thi lewdness, Dawe,  
 or of wilful lesynges ;  
 ffor Poule laborid with his hondes,  
 and other postilles also ;  
 Ȝee, oure gentil Jhesu,  
 as it is openly knowe.  
 and thes were the best prestes  
 that ever rose on grounde.<sup>1</sup>

We shall see that the chief aim of the reviser, with regard to his use of the original, has been to expunge all personal references to the anchoresses for whom it was written, and, by manipulation of the rest, to make it applicable to

onelich men & wymmen & to alle oþer þat desiren forto seruen god . . .<sup>2</sup>

On the whole, this manipulation has been very skilfully carried out, although it has necessitated the omission of some of the most vividly written passages : but here and there the work has been too much for the ingenuity of the reviser. Such passages as

Forþi my leue breþeren and sustren . witeþ wel ȝoure eigen and cloþe  
 ȝou to folde blak & white,<sup>3</sup>

the section on p. 29.10-27, and the clumsy adaptation on p. 179.8-13 must be set down as failures.

The reviser was obviously much attracted by the treatment in the original of the Seven Deadly Sins : this section represents his most important borrowing without alteration. This may be because of the affinity of this section of the *Ancren Riwele* with the animal "figures" so frequently used in the sermons of the times. In the *Apology for Lollard Doctrines* a long passage, somewhat altered and intensified, is translated from Odo of Cheriton. It begins

What more abhominacoun of desolacoun in holi place þan þat a swyn  
 do vpon þe holy vestiment, and sing Goddis holy office ? houndis and  
 woluis roryn þe psalmis, os were woluis cryng ilk to oþer . . .<sup>4</sup>

it continues with a description of the beasts of the Seven Deadly Sins, and it concludes with the following remarkable piece of bravura :

And wen þe riche man dieþ, þe processiou of bestis is maad : þan in  
 figeris was depeyntid in þe walle, and þe swyn and þe wolf and oþer  
 bests berun þe cros and þe sergis, and ryngun þe bellis ; sir Beringary

<sup>1</sup> *Political Poems* II. 44-45.

<sup>2</sup> P. 2.

<sup>3</sup> P. 19 : the corresponding passage is in Morton 50.

<sup>4</sup> *Apology for Lollard Doctrines*, p. 58.



þe bere syngiþ þe messe; þe lioun wiþ oþer bestis schal be best fed,  
but ȝer þe more þat þey þole, ai þe more schal þe fendis torment.

In this connection we should also notice the compilation from the *Ancren Riwle* upon the text "The foxes have holes" given in an English sermon by the great fifteenth-century preacher Dr. William Lichfield.<sup>1</sup>

Before considering the content of the interpolations themselves, we should notice at least two passages where the reviser might rely upon an interpretation by his Lollard readers different from that intended by the author of the original, without any revision on his part. The first is

And þus ansuereþ to þe askers and seiþ þat ȝe ben blake þorouȝ þe grace  
of god & of seint James ordre þat he wroth last. . . .<sup>2</sup>

which represents

o þisse wise answered to þeo þet asked ou of ower ordre, & hweðer  
hwite oþer blake: siggeð þat ȝe beoð boðe þurh þe grace of God, & of  
seint James ordre, þet he wrot latere.<sup>3</sup>

I do not propose to enter into the vexed question of what the author of the original meant by "seint James ordre." One or two brief quotations from Lollard writings will suffice to show the interpretation which was given to the relevant passage in the Vulgate by Wycliffe and his followers. He, in his *Tractatus de Pseudo-Freri*, writes

James spekiþ not . . . of þe ordriþ þat holden here castels or liuen as  
ankeris, but of þe religioun þat crist haþ ordeyned to figte wiþ þe world  
& profite to needi men,<sup>4</sup>

with which we may compare

Freer, is there any perfecter  
rule of religion  
than Crist Gods sonne gave  
in his gospell to his brethren?  
or than that religion that saint James  
in his epistle maketh mention of?<sup>5</sup>

It is evident that the Lollards regarded the Epistle of St. James as giving instructions for the conduct of secular life, and that such

<sup>1</sup> Printed Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1926 p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> P. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Morton 10-12.

<sup>4</sup> Mathew, p. 304.

<sup>5</sup> *Political Poems*, II. 36; cf. also *Fasciculus Zizaniorum*, ed. W. W. Shirley, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 1858, pp. 477-8.

an interpretation of the passage in *The Recluse* might be expected from Lollard readers.

The second passage, which would have for Lollard readers an added, if not a different significance, is :

Obsecro vos tamquam aduenas & peregrinos vt abstineatis vos a carnalibus desiderijs que militant aduersus animam . . . Non habemus hic manentem Ciuitatem sed futuram inquirimus . . .<sup>1</sup>

and the exposition upon these texts, which is derived almost without alteration from the original.<sup>2</sup> We shall find that in their glosses upon these texts such Lollard advocates as Purvey,<sup>3</sup> William Thorpe,<sup>4</sup> and others<sup>5</sup> stoutly maintained that no reference to pilgrimages to shrines was intended, but that the texts were to be interpreted "spiritually."

So much for the reviser's use of the original. We shall find that the chief variations between the *Ancren Riwle* and *The Recluse* are to be found in the reviser's actual interpolations. The following are the longest and most important :

From	2.25	& on porte	to	3.2	wille . and keepe
	4.32	For seint Austyn		5.24	alle men
	6.17	Ve vobis		6.22	þing wiþinne
	17.9	Vche man		19.9	first Book
	20.22	ded is vche		21.4	be his wille
	22.25	þe bytt		22.34	alle pynes
	24.5	þo þat ben		24.12	roote of alle
	29.35	And þan chese		31.22	hij done <sup>6</sup>
	46.18	Ac whan		49.29	versifiour seiþ
	50.36	Also oþer		51.15	of god
	53.29	For hij		57.17	werlde
	57.28	Incrassatus		58.8	done to oþer
	59.21	And perfore		62.13	neuere passen
	64.9	þe sparewe		65.11	his briddes
	65.26	in þe first		66.28	his grace
	68.7	þat is		68.19	man doþe
	72.10	Ac for þis		80.9	oure werkes <sup>7</sup>
	91.26	seiþ oure lorde		92.32	tofore god
	93.17	Now willen		95.23	betynge louelich

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 164-5 : 1 Pet. ii. 11 ; Heb. xiii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Morton 348-50.

<sup>3</sup> *Sixteen Points*, printed in *The Lollard Bible* ; p. 406.

<sup>4</sup> Pollard, *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*, London, 1903, p. 138.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Pollard, 180. It is of interest to notice that Rolle in his *English Prose Psalter* has a similar "spiritual" interpretation of "peregrinus" : MS. Eton College 10 f. 53<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Except for 30.25-7.

<sup>7</sup> Except for 76.14-19.

From 97.11	<i>oiper entermetep</i>	to 99.5	<i>oure matier</i> <sup>1</sup>
110.24	<i>pat was goddes</i>	111.15	<i>pere porouz</i>
112.31	<i>Pencheþ here</i>	113.17	<i>olde schrewe</i>
121.11	<i>And it owe</i>	121.22	<i>holy wrytt seiþ</i>
123.4	<i>For zutt</i>	123.25	<i>þan nedeþ</i>
136.10	<i>Now þise</i>	136.29	<i>as we wil</i>
142.6	<i>zif þou seist</i>	142.14	<i>his wrenches</i>
149.2	<i>Hij bowen</i>	149.20	<i>þis poynt</i>
155.13	<i>And þan</i>	156.33	<i>of hem</i>
159.1	<i>Nou þan</i>	160.5	<i>as poule dude</i>
162.24	<i>Now vche</i>	164.3	<i>his synne</i>
191.29	<i>Look þan</i>	192.10	<i>serue god</i>
193.26	<i>Now jchil</i>	198.35	<i>pere jnne.</i>

Påhlsson, in the notes to his 1918 reprint, indicates that the content of many of these interpolations is of a Lollard character. We must now consider what criteria may be held valid in determining this. It may be said here that too much reliance should not be placed upon the use, in texts such as *The Recluse*, but more especially in writings of the fifteenth century, of the "jargon" which characterizes the writings of Wycliffe and his immediate followers, as determining the heretical nature of such writings. Although we find in *The Recluse* such phrases as *God's word*,<sup>2</sup> *God's law*,<sup>3</sup> *False Christian men*,<sup>4</sup> *False prophets*,<sup>5</sup> *Hypocrites*,<sup>6</sup> *Euen-Christian*,<sup>7</sup> *Men who have taken Christendom*,<sup>8</sup> and *Men of high life or high degree*,<sup>9</sup> the use of such terms is not, in itself, implicit evidence of Lollard origin. Much of this jargon antedates Wycliffe's early writings: such phrases as *False Christian men* are to be found in Rolle's English works<sup>10</sup>: and the opponents of the Lollards had already at an early date begun to return many of their adversaries' opprobrious epithets. Thus both sides are to be found accusing each other of heresy and apostasy.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, we should re-

<sup>1</sup> 97.9-11 are common to B, V, and *The Recluse*.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. pp. 5, 31.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. p. 93.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. p. 155.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. pp. 5, 54, 73 (n.b.).

<sup>6</sup> E.g. p. 6, 31, 53.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. p. 36.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. pp. 18, 97.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. pp. 48, 77, 100.

<sup>10</sup> Especially in the *Psalter*.

<sup>11</sup> "Heresy was, in fact, a thing detested everywhere, and no one readily admitted that he was a heretic or even considered himself so" (Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, 1908-13, I. 33). We should note that the reviser retains the "Eresie, God beo idoncked, ne rixleð nout in Engelond" of the original (Morton 82: *The Recluse* 36).

member that much of this invective reflects merely the impetus given to Bible-study early in the fourteenth century, and is derived directly from the Bible, as in the case of some of the commonest "jargon"—*Hypocrites*,<sup>1</sup> *Pharisees*,<sup>2</sup> *Blind watchmen*,<sup>3</sup> and *Blasphemy*.<sup>4</sup> By the turn of the century, it would seem that even the one phrase by the use of which the orthodox party claimed that they could recognize their opponents,<sup>5</sup> *God's law*, had passed into the common vocabulary of controversy. In the orthodox *Speculum Christiani* we find the lines

He may be callede bothe wytty and wys,  
That worldly maners can wele dyspise,  
And felow hem noght in nothyngne,  
That be a3eyns godys lawe and byddyngne,<sup>6</sup>

and in a fifteenth-century tract in a St. Albans Cathedral MS. the reader is adjured to read "Goddis lawe . . . if thou be a prest."<sup>7</sup> The reservation of Bible-reading to the clergy marks the tract as orthodox and anti-Lollard.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Matt. xv. 7.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Matt. xvi. 6.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Isa. lvi. 9.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Matt. xv. 19.

<sup>5</sup> See Rolle 393.

<sup>6</sup> *Speculum Christiani*, edited G. Holmstedt (E.E.T.S., 1929), p. 148.

<sup>7</sup> Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1933, pp. 292-4.

(To be concluded)

## SHAKESPEARE'S "STAR-CROSSED LOVERS"

By J. W. DRAPER

*Romeo and Juliet* is a tissue of improbable coincidence: Capulet's illiterate servant happens by mere chance to ask Romeo to read the list of those invited to his master's entertainment; Romeo, by a most unusual chance, decides to attend his arch-enemies' festivities, and so chances to fall in love with Juliet; at just this time the Prince chances to make a stringent edict against brawling, and Romeo chances to kill Tybalt and so is banished; and, also at just this time, Old Capulet chances to betroth Juliet to the Count Paris. Any one of these chances might singly be accepted; but why should they all occur within two days and just in the right order to set the plot in motion? Even more a matter of fortuity is the catastrophe: by chance, the Friar's letter to Romeo miscarries; by chance, Romeo meets and kills Paris at the tomb; by chance, the Friar is too late to intercept Romeo; and, by chance, Juliet awakens just too late to save her lover's life and just too soon for her father to save her from suicide. Indeed, never was love-affair more perfectly ill-timed; and yet, as if to emphasize this very fault, the master-dramatist, more than in any other play, marks, scene by scene, the days of the week and sometimes the very hours of the day. Truly, as Rümelin declares, "mere accident"<sup>1</sup> seems to guide the order of events; and, if this be so, the play has no integration of plot, does not illustrate the inevitable working of any general truth, and so can have no theme; without a theme, it has no ethos or significance; and, for all the gorgeous trappings of Shakespeare's lyric style, it is not tragedy but mere melodrama.

Indeed, the critics have had difficulty in assigning to *Romeo and Juliet* any universal meaning. Ulrici, Rötischer, Vehse,<sup>2</sup> and more recently Erskine<sup>3</sup> seem to feel that it expresses the evils of

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Furness Var., p. 466.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 451 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> J. Erskine, "Romeo and Juliet," in *Shakespearean Studies*, by members of the department of English in Columbia University, New York, 1916, p. 219.

civil feuds; but, in sharp contrast to Shakespeare's later, political tragedies,<sup>1</sup> neither the action nor the dialogue emphasizes the general injury to the state that feuds were supposed to effect; and, furthermore, the Prince himself declares that his objection to brawling chiefly arises not from such dangers but from the killing of his kinsman Mercutio.<sup>2</sup> Tieck and Maginn seem to consider that the tragic outcome derives from Romeo's impetuosity and too great haste; but is it Romeo's haste that brings him to the Capulet feast or that so crucially keeps the Friar's letter from arriving? Dowden says that "the moral theme of the play is the deliverance of a man from dream into reality"<sup>3</sup>; but surely such a change would improve the hero's chances for meeting the problems of life, and so result rather in comedy. Horn, more vaguely, suggests that the play expresses "the grand irony of life"; and Bodensiedt and Erskine feel that "tragic fate" directs it; but the ironies are as nothing compared with those of *Hamlet*, *Othello*, or *Lear*; and there is no fatal antecedent action, as in the *Ædipus*, that decrees an inescapable tragic consequence. Thus most critics, despite the obvious predominance of coincidence, seem to feel that the play has some sort of system or governing purpose; and they accordingly assign it various vague and rather divergent themes, none of which closely fits the plot or explains its sudden leaps without causality from one episode to another. Shakespeare generally gave the stories that he used a timely realism and *vraisemblance*; and his utter failure to link the events of *Romeo and Juliet* in any certain, or even probable, connection is a strange departure from his usual artistry.

In the main trend of the story, Shakespeare follows rather closely Brooke's poem, which is generally recognized as the chief source for the play. Brooke tells the tale as a "wofull chance", with little effort to explain the chances that occur; and he and Paynter, Shakespeare's other possible source, agree in repeatedly ascribing the course of events to "Fortune" or "false Fortune."<sup>4</sup> Shakespeare, however, makes little reference to Fortune as governing the action; and these references appear too late to explain the motivation of the plot.<sup>5</sup> A few passages somewhat casually ascribe

<sup>1</sup> See the present author, "Political Themes in Shakespeare's Later Plays", *J.E.G.P.*, xxxv. 61 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. i. 138 and 181, *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Dowden, *Shakespeare, a Critical Study*, London, 1876, pp. 106-7.

<sup>4</sup> On the history of "fortune", see H. P. Patch, *The Goddess Fortune in Medieval Literature*, Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

<sup>5</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. v. 61; v. ii. 17; and v. iii. 82.

the direction of events to "God" or "heaven"<sup>1</sup>; but the play has no clear-cut Christian moral, unless it be the evils of brawling, as indeed Paynter suggests, or the wickedness of a secret marriage, as Brooke implies; and the catastrophe is not the inevitable consequence of either of these things. Nevertheless, over the play hangs a certain tragic fate. Juliet cryptically answers Paris, "What must shall be"<sup>2</sup>; and reiterated premonitions suggest an evil end: the Prologue refers to the "death-mark'd love" of the two protagonists; Lady Capulet,<sup>3</sup> the Nurse,<sup>4</sup> and Friar Lawrence<sup>5</sup> give voice to ominous predictions; Romeo twice dreams—the second time that his lady found him dead; both lovers are "pale" and melancholy at parting; Romeo,<sup>6</sup> even while arranging his marriage, casts his defiance at "love-devouring death"<sup>7</sup>; he says that the killing of Mercutio "but begins the woe"<sup>8</sup>; and he declares that he and Paris are "writ in sour misfortune's book."<sup>9</sup> Juliet compares her love to the dangerous speed of lightning<sup>10</sup>; her "all-divining soul" sees Romeo "As one dead in the bottom of a tomb"<sup>11</sup>; she describes her case as "past hope, past cure, past help"<sup>12</sup>; and, as she takes the poison, "a faint cold fear" as to the outcome "thrills" her veins.<sup>13</sup> Is all this the mere convention of dramatic prolepsis—a mere pious pretence of inevitable catastrophe where no inevitability exists? Is Shakespeare no more than a theatrical charlatan, or did he really see in this tissue of circumstance a *rationnelle* and motivation that is not clear to us?

Not only is the play replete with ominous predictions, but many of these predictions are associated with the hours and days and with the heavenly bodies that mark time. The Prologue refers to Romeo and Juliet as "star-cross'd lovers". At the very beginning of the action, when Romeo starts for the Capulet feast, he says:

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, IV. i. 56; V. iii. 260; and V. iii. 292.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. i. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iv. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iii. 92.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iii. 1-3 and 145; V. iii. 135-136 and 153-154.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, III. v. 55.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, II. vi. 7.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 112-113.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, V. iii. 82.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 119.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, III. v. 55.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. i. 45.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. iii. 15.



. . . my mind misgives  
 Some consequence, yet hanging in the stars,  
 Shall bitterly begin his [its] fearful date  
 With this night's revels, and expire the term  
 Of a despised life closed in my breast,  
 By some vile forfeit of untimely death. . . .<sup>1</sup>

In Act II, Friar Lawrence invokes the good will of "the heavens",<sup>2</sup> but he fears that "after-hours will chide" all those concerned in the marriage.<sup>3</sup> When Capulet forces Juliet to the unwelcome match with Paris, she cries out: "Is there no pity sitting in the clouds . . ." <sup>4</sup> and later, "Alack, alack, that heaven should practise stratagems" against her.<sup>5</sup> At Juliet's seeming death, Lady Capulet and the Nurse blame the day and hour as "Accurst" and "black" and "lamentable", as if the very calendar were responsible; and the Friar, even more clearly, imputes the misfortunes of Capulet to astral influence:

The heavens do lour upon you for some ill;  
 Move them no more by crossing their high will.<sup>6</sup>

In Act V, when Romeo learns of Juliet's supposed death, he cries aloud, "then I defy you, stars!" <sup>7</sup> And when he is resolved to kill himself, he says that death will "shake the yoke of inauspicious stars From this world-wearied flesh."<sup>8</sup> Friar Lawrence imputes the killing of Paris to "an unkind hour,"<sup>9</sup> as if the blame lay on the heavenly bodies that mark the passing time. Thus, if Shakespeare meant what his characters seem to say, astral influence actually governs the lives of these "star-cross'd lovers"; and, like so many of Chaucer's figures,<sup>10</sup> they are the puppets of the stars and planets and of the days and times of day.<sup>11</sup>

Although the stricter theologians looked askance and a few astronomers such as Copernicus must have had doubts, nevertheless

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 106, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II. vi. 1-2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, III. v. 196.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III. v. 209.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. v. 94-95.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, v. i. 24.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, v. iii. 111-112.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, v. iii. 145-146.

<sup>10</sup> See W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediæval Sciences*, New York, 1926.

<sup>11</sup> Writers on Shakespeare and astrology barely refer to *Romeo and Juliet*: W. Wilson, *Shakespeare and Astrology*, Boston, 1903; *Shakespeare's England*, Oxford, 1917, I. 444 *et seq.*; and C. Camden, "Astrology in Shakespeare's Day," *Isis*, XIX. 1 *et seq.*

the sixteenth century generally accepted astrology as a science<sup>1</sup>; Queen Elizabeth regularly employed the learned Dr. Dee to compute for her the lucky days and hours for undertaking her affairs; and, though only specialists mastered the more esoteric mysteries of casting a horoscope, yet all classes devoured books of popular astrology, edition on edition,<sup>2</sup> so that Ben Jonson could make it the basis of his masque, *Mercury Vindicated*. Everyone knew that the moon governed the rise and fall of tides; and what was man that he should escape such power?<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the farmer had to know the changes of the moon for the planting of his crops; and almanacs, which supplied this astrological information, were so plentifully produced that the Lambeth Palace Library, for the year 1595 alone, has no less than six by as many different publishers. Shakespeare himself makes constant reference to astrology; and Schmidt's *Lexicon* lists thirty-six examples of his use of *star* as "influencing human fortune," and four uses of *astronomer* as "astrologer."

To the Elizabethans, astrology had come down with some accretions from its Babylonian origins. They knew Greek astrology, partly from pseudo-Aristotle, Galen, and Ptolemy and partly through Arabic and mediæval authors; and a bevy of translators such as Warde,<sup>4</sup> Wither,<sup>5</sup> and Newton,<sup>6</sup> and popularizers such as Moulton,<sup>7</sup> Harvey,<sup>8</sup> and above all that assiduous compiler Thomas Hill,<sup>9</sup> supplied them with the traditional lore of astrology and its associated pseudo-sciences. Indeed, the Greeks, by a curious schematism, had linked astrology with their other learning; and the result, as transmitted by the Middle Ages, was an integrated and complex theory that embraced and co-related physical and biological know-

<sup>1</sup> The debate on the validity of astrology started with Pico della Mirandola just before 1500 (L. Thorndike, *History of Magic*, New York, 1934, Chap. lxi) and developed later in England (Camden, *op. cit.*).

<sup>2</sup> L. B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, Chapel Hill [N.C.], 1935, pp. 593 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> L. Lemnius, *Touchstone*, London, 1581, leaf 79<sup>r</sup>. Almanacks are said to have been of "readier money than Ale and cakes." See T. Nashe, "Have with You" (*Works*, ed. McKerrow, III. 72).

<sup>4</sup> W. Warde, tr., *The Most Excellent Booke of Arcandam*, London, 1592. Most of these rare volumes are to be found in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

<sup>5</sup> F. Wither, tr., C. Dariot, *Astrologicall Iudgement of the Starres*, London, 1598.

<sup>6</sup> T. Newton, tr., L. Lemnius, *Touchstone of Complexions*, London, 1581.

<sup>7</sup> T. Moulton, *Myrrour or Glass of Health*, ed. princ., London, 1539.

<sup>8</sup> R. Harvey, *Astrological Discourse*, London, 1582; supplement 1583.

<sup>9</sup> T. Hill, *Schoole of Skill*, London, 1599, etc. On Hill and his writings see Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 565.

ledge. Human beings were divided into four types, depending on which "humour", or bodily fluid, dominated their physique; and each of these humours was associated with a certain day, with certain planets and constellations, with a chemical "element," a season of the year, a period of a man's life, a colour, a metal, and a bodily condition of heat or dryness. This astro-biological lore, being largely a matter of tradition, shows less variety and disagreement than one might expect in different Elizabethan authors; and, without attempting to plumb the mysteries of "judicial" astrology, *i.e.* the casting of horoscopes, one can, at least approximately, set forth the more obvious phases of the subject. Perfect health of mind and body arose from a perfect balance of the four "humours"; but, in most men, one humour or another predominated, either by nature from birth or by the circumstances of the occasion. Blood, supposed to be generated in the stomach, gave to those whom it controlled a sanguine temper; it was considered hot and moist and was associated with youth and spring-time. Sanguine persons were thought to be under the influence of the constellations Gemini, Libra, and Aquarius and of the planet Jupiter, and so were of a jovial disposition. This disposition especially prevailed from midnight to six in the morning, and its day was Thursday. Its colour was white, its metal electrum, and its chemical element the air. The sanguine man was handsome and lucky, and Jupiter was called "the greater fortune." A superfluity of phlegm, supposed to be generated in the liver or perhaps the stomach, made a man easy-going, slow-witted and "phlegmatic"; this humour was cold and moist and generally fortunate, and was associated with the element water, with middle age, and with autumn; such persons were under the influence of the constellations Cancer, Scorpio, and Pisces, and under either the planet Venus, which was grouped with Friday, copper, and yellow, or the moon, which was grouped with Monday and silver. The phlegmatic humour achieved its greatest power from six in the evening until midnight, and especially on Mondays. A superfluity of bile, called "choler," generated in the heart and found chiefly in the gall-bladder, made a man wrathful or "choleric"; this humour was hot and dry, and was associated with fire, youth, and summer; such persons were presumed to be under the influence of Aries, Sagittarius, and especially Leo, and of the ill-omened planet Mars, whose day was Tuesday, or, more luckily, of the sun, whose day was Sunday; their hours were from

six in the morning until noon; their metal was gold, and their colour red. A superfluity of black bile, generated chiefly in the brain and found chiefly in the spleen, made a man melancholy; this humour was cold and dry, and was associated with winter and old age; such persons were under the influence of Taurus, Virgo, and Capricorn, and of that most ill-omened planet Saturn, and were therefore of saturnine disposition; their hours comprised the afternoon and their day was Saturday; their metal was lead, their colour grey, and their chemical element the earth. The present study proposes to examine the chief characters of the play to ascertain how well they fit into these four types, and how well their actions and the outcome of these actions accord with their days and times of day.

Gervinus<sup>1</sup> and Law<sup>2</sup> note the sharp contrast between Tybalt, Benvolio, and Mercutio; and this contrast, upon close examination, seems to spring from the fact that each represents a distinct type in the medical and astro-biological theory of the day. Tybalt is clearly of the choleric or wrathful type: he is always ready to fight, a quality that brings about the tragic catastrophe; he is "fiery" and "furious" and admits his "wilful choler"<sup>3</sup>; and Benvolio refers to "the unruly spleen of Tybalt deaf to peace."<sup>4</sup> Although the spleen was often associated with melancholy, yet it was also considered the seat of anger<sup>5</sup>; and, as the choleric man, of disposition hot and dry,<sup>6</sup> was supposed to be much given to anger in its entire gamut from mere "chyding" to "fighting, murder, robbery, sedition,"<sup>7</sup> Benvolio's reference to Tybalt's "unruly spleen" is quite appropriate to the latter's choleric nature. Choler, moreover, might properly predominate in early maturity<sup>8</sup>—about the right age for Old Capulet's nephew—and in the hot, dry months of summer when the play takes place. Of Tybalt's personal appearance, Shakespeare gives no direct clue<sup>9</sup>; but certainly the timing

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Furness Var., p. 456.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ed. Arden, p. xvi.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ed. Furness var., I. i. 102; III. i. 114; I. v. 87.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 150-151. Tybalt is "a gentleman of the very first house" (II. iv. 22-23); and this may refer to Aries, which governed the choleric type. His name signifies a cat; and perhaps this also is significant. See Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 96<sup>v</sup> et seq.

<sup>5</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 138<sup>r</sup> and 138<sup>v</sup>. Cf. N.E.D., s. *spleen*.

<sup>6</sup> Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, tr. Ashmand, London, 1827, pp. 149, 198; Hill, *op. cit.*, leaf 8<sup>v</sup>; and Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 86<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Arcandam, *op. cit.*, sig. M2<sup>r</sup>; and Lemnie, *op. cit.*, leaf 23<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> L. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes*, Cambridge, 1930, p. 60.

<sup>9</sup> Hill (*op. cit.*, leaf 8<sup>v</sup>) imputes to this type thick, black, bushy hair; but

and the outcome of the events in which he participates agree with the dominant hours of the choleric man : Capulet manages to quiet him at the festivities when Romeo appears ; for it is between 6 p.m. and midnight in the phlegmatic period of the day ; and Tybalt's fight and death on Monday afternoon are quite correctly timed : the day itself was phlegmatic and the time of day melancholy, and consequently his martial powers would have ebbed at noon, when the choleric part of the day was over. A complete accord of each character and his every act with the appropriate times would hardly be dramatically possible ; and yet the part of Tybalt, minor and fragmentary though it is, agrees with the scheme of the Elizabethan pseudo-sciences, as to his bodily humour and his psychological bent, as to his age and the season of the year, as to the timing of events by the day and time of day. Nothing of this appears in Shakespeare's sources : the season is winter, with the days and hours only vaguely marked. Could Shakespeare, by mere accident, have introduced so many consistent details ; and would an Elizabethan audience, steeped in such lore, have failed to realize their significance ?

Also choleric, perhaps by nature, perhaps because of the season of the year, is Old Capulet. His wife, quite properly, thinks this humour inappropriate to his age ; and, when in the first street-brawl he demands his sword, she suggests that a crutch would be more fitting. He is "too hot," *i.e.* too angry, toward Juliet<sup>1</sup> ; and his impetuous, headstrong nature, like that of Tybalt, directly contributes toward the tragic catastrophe. His blood is still young ; and, even at night, he complains of heat rather than of chill<sup>2</sup> ; and, though he is "old,"<sup>3</sup> he seems to long for his "dancing days" and the masquerades of thirty years before.<sup>4</sup> Such another testy old gentleman is Montague, who itches to fight the "villain Capulet."<sup>5</sup> Among the Elizabethans decrepitude set in at about the age of forty ; for they lived hard and were primitive in their hygiene and sanitation.<sup>6</sup> Thus Capulet, whose reference to his "dancing days"

Ptolemy (*op. cit.*, 149) thinks red hair of moderate growth ; and Arcandam (*op. cit.*, sig. M1<sup>r</sup>) seems to agree.

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. v. 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I. v. 25-26.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I. v. 29 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I. i. 72.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I. ii. 2-3.

<sup>6</sup> *Cyruile and Vncyruile Life* (ed. princ., 1579) in *Inedited Tracts*, ed. Hazlitt, Rox. Lib., London, 1868, p. 75 ; E. Tilney, *Flower of Friendship*, London, 1568, sig. Biii<sup>r</sup> ; [? I.M.], *General Practise of Medicine*, London, 1634, sig. B2<sup>v</sup> ; L. Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 29<sup>r</sup> *et passim* ; and Arcandam, *op. cit.*, sig. M2<sup>v</sup>.

would place his years about fifty or beyond, is certainly enjoying a very green old age.<sup>1</sup>

In sharp contrast to these choleric types is the phlegmatic Benvolio; and Shakespeare points and repoints this contrast.<sup>2</sup> As Benvolio's name suggests, he is easy-going and friendly. "Fleame" was thought to be cold and moist and "wearyish"; and Benvolio is "weary."<sup>3</sup> Such men were supposed to be affable, slow, dull, forgetful, soft of flesh, of small appetite, fat, short, possessed of little hair, of pale complexion, and given to dreams of rain and swimming.<sup>4</sup> Mercutio, to be sure, compliments Benvolio by calling him "as hot a Jack . . . as any in Italy"<sup>5</sup>; but the latter's obvious preference for peace gives the lie to such a description: at the very beginning of the play he tries to avoid a brawl; and he opens the crucial third act with a speech of similar import to Mercutio:

I pray thee, good Mercutio, let's retire:  
The day is hot, the Capulets abroad,  
And, if we meet, we shall not 'scape a brawl;  
For now these hot days is the mad blood stirring.

He urges the swashbucklers to drop their swords and "reason coldly"<sup>6</sup>; and, after the fray is over, he refers to "The unlucky manage of this fatal brawl."<sup>7</sup> In the first act, moreover, he pursues his phlegmatic humour by not pursuing Romeo.<sup>8</sup> Heat was supposed to make persons of this temperament more sanguine<sup>9</sup>; and perhaps this influence makes Benvolio hopeful of avoiding brawls and, at the beginning of the play, of curing Romeo's love-sickness; but the heavens prevent his purposes; and, as the momentum of the tragedy develops, he drops out of sight as if his phlegmatic temper and sanguine hopes and lucky influence were inappropriate to the catastrophe.

The name Mercutio, which Shakespeare derived from his source, doubtless suggested that the character be depicted as of the mercurial cast; and, indeed, this may have supplied the hint from

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Falstaff. See Ruth Sims, *The Green Old Age of Falstaff*, about to appear.

<sup>2</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. i. 16 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I. i. 121. He is also fortunate in that he escapes the catastrophe.

<sup>4</sup> *Batman upon Bartholome*, London, 1582, leaves 31<sup>v</sup> and 32<sup>r</sup>; Arcandam, *op. cit.*, sig. Mi<sup>r</sup> and Mi<sup>v</sup>; Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaves 23<sup>r</sup>, 86<sup>v</sup>, 111<sup>v</sup>; 122<sup>r</sup>; 146<sup>r</sup>; Hill, *op. cit.*, 16 and 26; and Darlot, *op. cit.*, sig. D4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. i. 11-12.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 47.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 136 *et passim*.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, I. i. 122-123.

<sup>9</sup> Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 59.



which Shakespeare conceived his whole tragedy of humours. The mercurial temper is most difficult to define; for persons under that planet's influence might by attraction partake of any one of the four humours, and so were chameleon-like in their variety:

*Mercurie* in all things is common and mutable, he is good with the good, and euill with the euill, with the Masculine, masculine, with the Feminines, feminine, hote with the hote and moyst with the moyst, infortunate with the infortunes, and fortunate with the fortunes, especially when he is ioyned or corporally applying vnto them, or beholdeth them with some good aspect.<sup>1</sup>

Just so, Mercutio changes to the wrathful type at the entrance of the angry Tybalt; and this same quick adaptability he urges vainly upon Romeo.<sup>2</sup> The mercurial type was supposed to be a "nimble person" and a go-between in love-affairs<sup>3</sup>; and Mercutio by nature has "dancing shoes with nimble soles"<sup>4</sup> and he joins with Benvolio in trying to distract Romeo and cure him of the unhappy love for Rosaline. This type, moreover, was supposed to be "volatile, sprightly, and ready-witted."<sup>5</sup> Both Brooke and Paynter agree in calling Mercutio "pleasant and courteous" and popular with ladies; and they add that he had a fiery mind but cold hands—a suggestion of the inconsistent mercurial temperament. Shakespeare's Mercutio is certainly garrulous: he "talks of nothing"<sup>6</sup>; he "loves to hear himself talk"<sup>7</sup>; and he "will speak more in a minute than he will stand to in a month"<sup>8</sup>; and, on occasion, he takes the stage for forty-two lines on the "inconstant" topic of dreams.<sup>9</sup> He calls himself "the very pink of courtesy,"<sup>10</sup> and readily adapts his talk to the occasion, witty, consolatory, or obscene<sup>11</sup>; and he is so susceptible to environment that he seems to feel the chill of night more even than Old Capulet.<sup>12</sup> He is quite fitly killed on Monday afternoon—a phlegmatic day and

<sup>1</sup> Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. Di<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 27-28.

<sup>3</sup> N.E.D., s. *mercury*.

<sup>4</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 14-15.

<sup>5</sup> N.E.D., s. *mercurial*. Mercury's influence, moreover, was supposed to make men ingenious. See Hill, *Schoole*, ed. cit., leaf 50<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 96.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 132.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 133-134.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I. iv. 53-95.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 52.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 100-101. He talks bawdry to the Nurse, perhaps appropriately.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II. i. 40.



a melancholy time of day that would depress the mercurial temperament and subject him the more easily to Tybalt's onslaught.

Juliet's old Nurse should also, perhaps, be accounted of the mercurial type. Juliet, to be sure, impatiently accused her of having the phlegmatic and melancholy symptoms of old age, "unwieldy, slow, heavy and pale as lead"<sup>1</sup>; but, at the time, she is doubtless under the phlegmatic influence of Monday, and certainly her interminable garrulity and her willingness to shift from Paris to Romeo and back suggest that by nature she shares Mercutio's cast of mind. These minor characters, especially Tybalt and Mercutio, conform rather closely to their astrological prototypes; and an examination from this point of view of the two principals in the play would seem to be worth while.

Juliet is clearly of a hot, passionate temperament. She falls in love with Romeo at first sight, and she even dares to gainsay her father's orders to his face. The Nurse calls her "hot"<sup>2</sup> and tells an anecdote of her babyhood that the credulous might interpret as a sign of passion.<sup>3</sup> At the beginning of the play, she is not quite yet fourteen,<sup>4</sup> and so has hardly had an opportunity to show her nature; but the stars had given her this nature even from her birth, and Shakespeare carefully impresses on the audience the horoscope of her nativity; and twice we are told that she was born on "Lammas-eve at night,"<sup>5</sup> that is when the sun was in the house of the constellation Leo.<sup>6</sup> Those born under Leo were supposed to be choleric and passionate if not incontinent, inclined to be stout and often barren; and the type was associated with youth and summer.<sup>7</sup> If then Juliet is of this hot complexion, her planet should be Mars or the sun; and with the latter the text constantly associates her: she shines so brightly that she shames the torches<sup>8</sup>; she is called the "sun"<sup>9</sup>; Romeo refers to her "light"<sup>10</sup>; Friar Lawrence compares her to "the sun" clearing away Romeo's sighs<sup>11</sup>; Juliet

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. v. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II. v. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I. iii. 42 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I. ii. 9; I. iii. 12 *et seq.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I. iii. 17 and 21.

<sup>6</sup> Lammas-eve would be July 31 O.S., i.e. August 10 N.S. The sun is in the sign of Leo from July 21 to August 21.

<sup>7</sup> Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. Biii' and Biii". Venus and Leo were thought to incite lust. See Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, III. 3, 2, 2, 1.

<sup>8</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. v. 42.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 3.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 155.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iii. 74.

herself compares her love-thoughts to "the sun's beams" <sup>1</sup>; she is a "lantern" and "her beauty makes This vault a feasting presence full of light" <sup>2</sup>; and, at her death, the Prince declares that "The sun for sorrow will not show his head." <sup>3</sup> The Nurse cannot find Romeo for her until the sun is in the ascendant at high noon <sup>4</sup>; and the poison, counteracting her natural impulse, makes her "cold and drowsy." <sup>5</sup> Some of these references may be mere metaphor, but they are too numerous and too apt to Juliet's choleric nature to be entirely accident; and, moreover, metaphor was so commonly a part of the method of scientific thought that a metaphoric use does not preclude a strictly technical one. Juliet, therefore, like Tybalt and Old Capulet, is hot and dry, but only moderately so, for she is under the influence of the sun rather than of Mars. <sup>6</sup> Cholera was supposed to be most active in summer <sup>7</sup>; and the characteristics of this type were amply chronicled in contemporary pseudo-science: such an one was slender, of moderate stature, "lyuely, daper, quycke," <sup>8</sup> and "prouoketh to ye works of Venus" <sup>9</sup>; and "neyther can they so well rule they own affections because in their reasonings and discourses they be so very earnest and hasty." <sup>10</sup> Thus the heat of summer clearly brings out in the maturing Juliet the traits of character fixed by her birth when her planet <sup>11</sup> the sun was in the sign of the zodiac Leo.

The most complex of all these figures is Romeo. He first appears as an example of the melancholy type, and so suffers under the influence of Saturn, <sup>12</sup> which was styled "the greatest infortune." Even before he enters, his father describes his tears and sighs, and declares that his "humour" is "Black and portentous." <sup>13</sup> He has been avoiding the sun, and "locks fair daylight out" <sup>14</sup>; and, when he enters, he declares that the love for Rosaline that afflicts him is a

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. v. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, v. iii. 84 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, v. iii. 305.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II. v. 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. i. 96.

<sup>6</sup> Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. D<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>8</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 129<sup>r</sup> and 129<sup>v</sup>. Many of these details could hardly apply to a young woman, and so are omitted.

<sup>9</sup> Batman, *op. cit.*, leaf 32<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 59; and Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. D3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Of course the sun was a planet according to the generally accepted Ptolemaic system.

<sup>12</sup> Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. Civ<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. i. 133.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, I. i. 124 *et passim*.

"choking gall".<sup>1</sup> Clearly, Romeo, whatever his natural humour, is suffering from love-melancholy. Heaviness and the metal lead were particularly associated with this bodily condition;<sup>2</sup> and Romeo is "heavy"<sup>3</sup>; he "cannot bound a pitch above dull woe"<sup>4</sup>; he has "a soul of lead"<sup>5</sup>; and he compares his love to a "heavy lightness" and a "Feather of lead".<sup>6</sup> Melancholy often brought on madness<sup>7</sup>; and Mercutio fears for his sanity<sup>8</sup>; and Benvolio proposes the proper cures of diversion and counter-attraction.<sup>9</sup> Romeo's condition is like that of Orsino at the beginning of *Twelfth Night*; but his case is more violent, perhaps because, as the learned Friar says, his disposition is not well "temper'd".<sup>10</sup> At all events, he is obviously given to "extremities".<sup>11</sup>

On falling in love with Juliet, however, Romeo rebounds to his natural self. Melancholy is cold and dry, unhappy, and saturnine; but Romeo, in the bloom of youth and lofty station, could partake of such a humour only because of some immediate, overpowering impulse, for "trouble and affection" can change one's disposition.<sup>12</sup> Romeo, by nature sanguine,<sup>13</sup> quickly returns to his innate merry self.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, at the very moment that he climbs Juliet's garden wall, he would seem to renounce his former bitter mood: earth, as a chemical element, was associated with melancholy<sup>15</sup>; and Romeo cries out: "Turn back, dull earth, and find thy centre out."<sup>16</sup> This tendency to variable extremes was in itself a sign of a hot disposition; for such a humour was described as "variable and changeable."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. i. 187. See John Cole, "Romeo and Rosaline," about to appear.

<sup>2</sup> Hill, *Schoole*, ed. cit., 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. i. 130; I. iv. 12, 15 and 35-36.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I. iv. 21.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I. iv. 14.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I. i. 171 et passim.

<sup>7</sup> See the present author, "Hamlet's Melancholy", *Ann. Med. Hist.*, IX N.S., p. 142.

<sup>8</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. iv. 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I. ii. 46 et seq. Lemnius prescribes "Moderate myrth and banqueting," leaf 154<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iii. 115. See the present author, "The Melancholy Duke Orsino," the *Bulletin* of the Johns Hopkins Institute of the History of Medicine, about to appear.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I. v. 156.

<sup>12</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 92<sup>r</sup> and 92<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. iv. 78 et seq. The sanguine type was supposed to be particularly susceptible to love. See Burton, *op. cit.*, III. 2, 2, 1; J. Ferrand, *Éprouvavia*, Oxford, 1640, p. 64; and N. Coeffeteau, *Table of Humane Passions*, London, 1621, p. 551.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 79 et seq.

<sup>15</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 86<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. i. 1-2.

<sup>17</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 45<sup>r</sup>.

In the last four acts, Romeo clearly shows the effects of his sanguine humour. His whole love-affair betrays a cast of mind that is hopeful against obstacles, and impatient of cold reason; and this very quality helps to induce the tragic ending. Even as he leaves Juliet, condemned to exile from Verona, he is still hopeful, and protests against "Dry sorrow" because it "drinks our blood"<sup>1</sup>; and he prosecutes his wooing and insists upon the marriage, with an untimely haste. His association with the moon,<sup>2</sup> to be sure, rather suggests the phlegmatic; but this may be mere contrast to Juliet as the sun; and folklore, moreover, takes the moon as the source of moisture that causes decay and growth<sup>3</sup>; and so perhaps Romeo, of a hot and moist complexion, might be associated with it. Romeo's sanguine humour, moreover, fits with his good looks: the Nurse catalogues his physical attractions *seriatim* in the best sonnet style<sup>4</sup>; and the sanguine man was supposed to be "mery, pleasant [witty], fayre, and of a ruddy colour,"<sup>5</sup> to have "comely" stature and a handsome appearance "consonãte to manly dignity."<sup>6</sup> Indeed, blood was the "best of all the humours" and was associated with youth and spring.<sup>7</sup> Romeo is by nature "mery" and "pleasant" and can overcome even the volatile Mercutio at persiflage<sup>8</sup>: truly, he seems to show all the good qualities of the sanguine man. He has also the weakness of the humour: blood could produce "riot and wilfulness"<sup>9</sup>; and those who had a superfluity, when "too much chafed," are prone to act "like mad-men"<sup>10</sup>; quite of this sort is Romeo's rage against Tybalt, and his rage against himself when he has killed Tybalt, "The unreasoning fury of a beast."<sup>11</sup> In short, Romeo, in his rapid changes from saturnine love-melancholy to his natural joyous disposition, and thence on occasion to unreasoning rage, is a rather clear portrayal of the sanguine man: he woos Juliet in one night and marries her next day in defiance of all obstacles; he has the sanguine man's good

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. v. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 107; and III. ii. i *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Sir J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, London, 1919, VI. 132 and 137.

<sup>4</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. v. 39 *et seq.*

<sup>5</sup> Arcandam, *op. cit.*, sig. M2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaves 48<sup>r</sup> and 49<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, leaf 86<sup>r</sup>; Batman, *op. cit.*, leaf 30<sup>r</sup>; Campbell, *op. cit.*, 58; and Darriot, *op. cit.*, sig. D2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. iv. 63-64.

<sup>9</sup> Lemnius, *op. cit.*, leaf 101<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Arcandam, *op. cit.*, M1<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, III. iii. 111.

looks and wit and dignity of bearing, and also his wilful fury under provocation. The choleric Tybalt, Capulet and Montague, all under the influence of Mars, the choleric Juliet under the influence of Venus, the phlegmatic Benvolio, the mercurial Mercutio and the Nurse, and the sanguine Romeo, now under the power of love-melancholy and now of fury : all of these surely make of *Romeo and Juliet* an astrological tragedy of humours.

The Elizabethan pseudo-sciences, however, were associated not only with human character but also with the calendar ; and, as the month and the days of the week are rather clearly marked throughout the play, a review of the action day by day should indicate how far the periods of predominance of certain humours govern the outcome of the episodes. The reference to "Lammas-tide,"<sup>1</sup> i.e. August 1, as "A fortnight and odd days" to come, clearly places the action in the "hot days" of the middle of July, when "the mad blood [is] stirring"<sup>2</sup> ; and summer was associated with the hot, dry, choleric temperament. In the very first scene, moreover, the word-play on "choler" strikes at once the keynote of the season as well as of the action. This setting in the heat of summer is Shakespeare's own deliberate change from his two reputed sources, in both of which the story begins in winter and drags on into spring. Shakespeare, in fact, even has Juliet declare that "summer's ripening breath" has matured their "bud of love"<sup>3</sup> ; and thus one may impute both the love and the hate that motivated the tragedy to the season of the year and the sign of the zodiac.

The old mediæval system of "elections" according to which each hour after dawn brought one luck or misfortune under a changing astral influence, varying according to the time of dawn and according to the day of the week—all this system was far too complex for an audience to follow, and would have required too much rapid calculation on their part to be effective : Shakespeare, therefore, was obliged to use some simpler method wherever he proposed to govern his plot by the luck or ill-luck of days and hours. In his sources, the action of the play consumes several months ; he begins it on Sunday and ends it early Thursday morning.<sup>4</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iii. 14 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 2-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 121.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel ends the play Friday (*Trans. New Shak. Soc.*, 1877-79, 194) ; for a discussion of his mistake, see old Rolfe ed., 202-19. See also Ferrand, *op. cit.*,

first act and the first two scenes of the second occupy Sunday, that is Juliet's day. The opening street-brawl apparently takes place in the morning, a part of the day when the choleric humour was predominant; and the second scene, in which Romeo reads the list of guests to be invited to Capulet's supper, seems to occur that afternoon; and, at about the same time, the third scene in which Lady Capulet and the Nurse discuss Juliet's age. Scene four is in the evening; and the maskers are hurrying to the Capulet residence. Benvolio declares: "Supper is done, and we shall come too late"; and Romeo answers him:

I fear, too early: for my mind misgives  
Some consequence yet hanging in the stars,  
Shall bitterly begin his [its] date  
With this night's revels . . . <sup>1</sup>

This speech, spoken by the hero and coming at the final climax of the scene, seems particularly significant: Romeo quite properly fears bad influence at that time of the day; for the evening would not usually be favourable either to his natural sanguine disposition or to the melancholy humour that for the time afflicts him. Indeed, how else can one explain his fear of being "too early" coupled with his misgivings of bad astral consequences? In the fifth scene, the maskers arrive as the hall is cleared for dancing; and, at first sight, Romeo and Juliet fall in love, converse in a perfect sonnet, and then kiss and part. The time of day is phlegmatic, and Tybalt's anger is restrained by Capulet; but, even so, it is no lucky hour for the two lovers. In the first scene of Act II, Romeo gives the slip to his merry companions; and, in the second, he is under Juliet's window. This famous dialogue in which the two plight their troth clearly takes place in the sanguine period after midnight; for, near the end, Juliet remarks that it is "almost morning."<sup>2</sup>

While "grey-eyed morn smiles on the frowning night" Friar Lawrence is out gathering herbs; he meets Romeo and advises prudence. The next scene is in the late morning. The Nurse, having searched since nine o'clock, at last comes upon Romeo in the company of his merry friends. Her slowness in finding him is stressed both here and in a later scene; but the situation and the

Chap. xxi, who seems to feel that the stars had only a very limited influence over the human body; and P. Boasystuau, *Theatrum Mundi*, tr. Alday, London, 1574, 202-3, who also seems to think the humours more important.

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 106 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II. ii. 176.



dialogue that explain it seem alike without dramatic reason; and perhaps one should suppose that the Nurse, though perhaps by nature mercurial, has, with advancing age, grown phlegmatic or even melancholy.<sup>1</sup> If melancholy, her lucky hours did not begin till noon; and, just after Mercutio says that it is noon,<sup>2</sup> the Nurse finds Romeo, and so can make the appointment for him to marry Juliet that afternoon. Thus the marriage takes place in the time of day dominated by the unlucky melancholy humour, for melancholy was associated with Saturn and his malefic influence. That same fatal afternoon, Mercutio and Tybalt are both killed and Romeo, "fortune's fool,"<sup>3</sup> is banished by the Duke. These are the critical hours of the play; and Juliet may well wish the sun's "fiery-footed steeds"<sup>4</sup> to hurry by, for evening will bring less dangerous auspices. So Juliet is wed; and that night the marriage is consummated<sup>5</sup>; but the unfriendly streaks of morning bring in Tuesday, the choleric day of Mars and of dead Tybalt's vengeance, for on that day Romeo's exile starts.<sup>6</sup>

Old Capulet, meanwhile, intent on marrying Juliet to Paris, sets Thursday for the happy event,<sup>7</sup> and then moves it forward to Wednesday,<sup>8</sup> and on this same unlucky Tuesday forces the already wedded Juliet to consent. This Tuesday, which comprises most of the fourth act, is a welter of ill-omened preparations; Romeo hastens to depart; the Capulet household is preparing for the wedding; and Juliet is preparing, by the use of the Friar's drug, to frustrate their preparations. She takes the potion with deep misgivings, as well she may. The working of this drug has caused great trouble to commentators. The Friar declares that it is supposed to last "two and forty hours"<sup>9</sup>; and his calculations must be true, for he reaches the tomb about the time that Juliet actually awakes.<sup>10</sup> Forty-two hours, however, from Tuesday night when she takes the potion would bring her waking to the following Thursday afternoon or early evening; and, in fact, she wakes very late

<sup>1</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, II. v. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II. iv. 100-101.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III. i. 129. In Paynter, the marriage takes place on Saturday, and much time elapses before the catastrophe.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, III. ii. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iii. 164 and 172.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, III. iii. 167 *et seq.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, III. v. 111 and 152.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. ii. 24 *et seq.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. i. 105.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, V. iii. 252.



at night and apparently on Wednesday. The present writer hazards the suggestion that "two and forty" is a textual slip for "four and twenty", which would agree with both the metre and the circumstances.<sup>1</sup> On this same Tuesday occurs one of the most fatal chances of the tragedy: the Friar's letter fails to reach Romeo, and so Romeo fails to do his part in the plan that was to unite him with his bride.

Wednesday, the day of changeable Mercury, begins with the discovery of Juliet's seeming death; and, indeed, Wednesday is full of change and violent reversal; the wedding is quickly turned into a funeral; Juliet seems to die, then lives, then dies; the hopes of the good Friar change to bitter failure; and Romeo, fresh from happy dreams,<sup>2</sup> hears of his wife's death and believes the news, returns, kills Paris, and takes poison. When Juliet is first discovered in seeming death, the Nurse and Lady Capulet lament the "Accursed, unhappy, wretched, hateful day"<sup>3</sup> no less than fourteen times: surely they thought that the day had something to do with their misfortunes. Mercury was supposed to be good or evil depending on its relation to other influences<sup>4</sup>: Juliet's cold body is found in the morning; the funeral apparently takes place in the afternoon, when melancholy was the predominant humour; and the death of the lovers, before midnight. The final reconciliation of the rival houses seems to occur in the early hours of Thursday,<sup>5</sup> a sanguine day and time of day: perhaps by this Shakespeare meant that the reconciliation was well-founded and permanent.

Contemporary scientific theory, in short, does much to explain the plot of *Romeo and Juliet*, and reduces considerably the amount of apparent coincidence. Shakespeare changes the time of the tragedy to mid-July, when "summer's ripening breath" matures both the love of the protagonists and the hate of the rival houses. The sub-major figures, in their characters and actions and sometimes even in their physiques, fit into the scheme of humours. The passionate character of Juliet, necessary to her part in the tragedy, agrees with her association with the sun and her birth under the sign of Leo; and the impetuous fervour of Romeo, careless of

<sup>1</sup> Juliet took the potion an hour or more after it was "near night" (iv. ii. 39).

<sup>2</sup> *Romeo and Juliet*, v. i. 1 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, iv. v. 17 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Duriot, *op. cit.*, sig. D1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> At the end of the scene, the Prince refers to "this morning" as if the sun were about to rise.

results, is consonant with his sanguine disposition. Some of the actual coincidences, moreover, can be traced to the day or time of day: the choleric morning hours would seem to give rise to the initial brawl; and this brawl in turn causes the Prince's edict, which in turn causes Romeo's fatal banishment. Romeo's going to the Capulet festivities "too early" makes possible his meeting with Juliet and his falling in love with her; the phlegmatic hours of evening explain Capulet's success in restraining Tybalt at the moment; and the thoughtless abandon of the balcony scene is quite proper to the sanguine hours after midnight. The crucial deaths of Tybalt and of Mercutio, furthermore, take place in the afternoon, when ill-omened melancholy was supposed to rage; and Romeo's banishment and Juliet's wedding fall on Tuesday, the unlucky day of Mars. Indeed, again and again, not only the forebodings of the characters but also the auspices of the humours and the calendar point to a tragic catastrophe: the "death-mark'd love" of "star-cross'd lovers" cannot end happily. Thus the theme of the play is not the evils of civil faction, as in Paynter, or the wickedness of "stolne contractes," as in Brooke, but rather, as in Greek tragedy, the hopelessness of defying the heavens' will. Both the Elizabethan theory of tragedy that derived from Seneca and Horace<sup>1</sup> and the general taste of the age<sup>2</sup> demanded an obvious moral theme; and Shakespeare, snatching a grace beyond the reach of Chapman or Kyd or Marlowe, seems to have turned popular science to his purpose to give the plot of his drama something of the inevitable sequence of Hellenic tragedy.

<sup>1</sup> See A. H. Gilbert, "Seneca and the Criticism of Elizabethan Tragedy," *P.Q.*, XIII. 370 *et seq.*; and Campbell, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 403 *et seq.* See also W. Farnham, *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*, Berkeley, Calif., 1936.

## COLLINS AND ALEXANDER CARLYLE

By P. L. CARVER

THE death of Colonel James Gardiner in the Battle of Prestonpans is the subject of a poem in ballad metre, generally believed to have been first published in 1790, in the third volume of Johnson's *Scots Musical Museum*. It is commonly known by the first line, " 'Twas at the hour of dark midnight," but I propose for convenience to refer to it by the earliest of the many titles assigned to it by various editors, *Fannie Weeping*. It describes how Fanny,<sup>1</sup> Colonel Gardiner's daughter, awoke in the night possessed by ghastly fears for her father's safety, and, running down, had her worst forebodings confirmed by a messenger, who, arriving at this moment, announced that he had seen Colonel Gardiner lying dead on the battlefield. The poet feels that Fanny's grief is only part of a greater tragedy, and concludes :

Sad was the fight, sad were the news,  
And sad was our complaining ;  
But oh ! for thee, my native land,  
What woes are yet remaining.

It is unlikely that the last line, which reads like a prophecy of Culloden, would have been in this form if the events described had already passed into history, and it is not surprising to find that the poem is, in fact, many years older than the *Scots Musical Museum*. It appeared anonymously in the *British Magazine* for July 1747, and, according to an introductory note, was composed on the day of the battle, September 21, 1745. When it was republished as a novelty in the *Scots Musical Museum* the name of the author was given as " the late Sir G. Elliot," and this unsupported statement, wrongly accepted as authoritative, has been repeated from one book of reference to another ever since. I believe that the editor was mistaken, and that the real author of *Fannie Weeping* was Elliot's contemporary and friend, Alexander Carlyle.

<sup>1</sup> Usually so spelt, though the poet seems to have preferred "Fannie". The *British Magazine* has "Fannie" in the poem itself, but "Fanny" in the list of contents.

The universal belief in Elliot's authorship has created a difficulty in the interpretation of a letter written by Smollett to Carlyle in 1747. Unfortunately the exact date has not been ascertained, but the year is significant as that in which *Fannie Weeping* made its first known appearance. Smollett writes :

Your gay catches please me much, and the Lamentations of Fanny Gardner has a good deal of nature in it, though, in my opinion, it might be bettered. Oswald has set it to an excellent tune, in the Scotch style ; but as it is not yet published, I cannot regale you with it at present.<sup>1</sup>

John Hill Burton, the editor of Carlyle's *Autobiography*, remarks that "there seems to be little doubt that the ballad of 'Fanny Gairdner' was written by his [Carlyle's] friend Sir Gilbert Elliot."<sup>2</sup> Mr. E. S. Noyes, the editor of Smollett's *Letters*, quotes Burton's note<sup>3</sup> without even correcting the spelling of "Gairdner," and there the matter rests. But for the testimony of the *Scots Musical Museum*, and the numerous repetitions which have given that testimony the appearance of established fact, it would have been obvious that "the Lamentations of Fanny Gardner" was another of the numerous titles of *Fannie Weeping*, and the poem could have been claimed for Carlyle on the authority of Smollett's letter.

At this point I am able to offer new evidence from an unexpected quarter. The *Newcastle Weekly Magazine* for September 4, 1766, contains this letter :

Gentlemen,

The following Ode was written by a minister of the church of Scotland, at the time of the rebellion in 1745, soon after the battle at Preston-Pans, where Col. Gardiner was killed ; who had left his daughter Fanny in Stirling-castle, for a place of security :—As I believe it was never printed, if you think it worthy a place in your Magazine, it will oblige,

Yours, L. S. W.

Then follows the complete poem, this time entitled *On the Death of Col. Gardiner*. The writer is, of course, mistaken in supposing that it had not been published before, but that is of no importance except

<sup>1</sup> Smollett's *Letters*, ed. Noyes, p. 7. Since the present article was written I have been allowed to see the original of this letter by the kindness of Mrs. Carlyle Bell, the present owner of the collection of papers left by Alexander Carlyle. Attached to the letter is a full copy in an unknown hand, of the poem *Fannie Weeping* ; and a note in the hand of the first Carlyle Bell (Carlyle's nephew and heir) states that this is the poem to which Smollett refers.

<sup>2</sup> *Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle*, ed. Burton (1910), p. 593.

<sup>3</sup> Smollett's *Letters*, ed. Noyes, p. 118.

as pointing to the interesting possibility that he had access to the original manuscript. Whatever may have been the source of his information, his comparatively early and circumstantial statement is of far more weight than that of the *Scots Musical Museum*, and its effect is to rule Elliot out of consideration. Elliot, though a zealous Presbyterian, could never have been imagined as "a minister of the church of Scotland," whereas that is precisely what Carlyle was. It is not unlikely that the manuscript had at some time come into Elliot's possession and remained among his papers. That would account for the association of his name with the poem, though it is hardly less probable that the statement in the *Scots Musical Museum* is mere guesswork.

Though *Fannie Weeping* is not of such importance as to justify a long discussion, I should like to add one more piece of evidence in favour of Carlyle's authorship because it forms a link of connection with two other poems, both found in the *British Magazine* for February 1747. We know that Miss Gardiner's real baptismal name was Richmond, and it must have been only in her immediate domestic circle that she was known as Fanny, or Fannie. Now it happens that Alexander Carlyle was in a position to speak of her by her more familiar name. His father's parish was in the immediate neighbourhood of Prestonpans, where Colonel Gardiner lived and met his death, and the two families were on intimate terms. When, therefore, we find an *Ode to the Memory of Colonel Gardiner* containing the line "My Fanny comes and comes with you," we are justified in suspecting Carlyle's authorship if we accept the stronger case for his authorship of *Fannie Weeping*. There is, unfortunately, no further evidence unless a certain similarity of tone and sentiment may be so considered. To mention one example: it would be characteristic of the author of the lines already quoted from *Fannie Weeping* to speak of "the genius of our sinking state."

Provisionally, on these grounds, I suggest Carlyle's authorship of the poem now to be quoted in full, though it would not lose its principal interest if it were proved to be by another hand:

AN ODE,

*To the Memory of Colonel Gardiner,  
In Imitation of Milton.*

Weep! 'tis Gard'ner's flow'ry rest,  
With Violets and Rosemary drest;  
Which spring, with dewy fingers cold  
Thick, sprinkles on his hallow'd mold.

Next, *Autumn's* eve, the fairy throng  
 Meet here ; at one his knell is rung ;  
 Then *honour* comes, a pilgrim grey,  
 To bless the turf that wraps his clay ;  
 And *freedom*, in her hermit wear,  
 From woods and wilds will saunter here ;  
*Religion* pure, a heavenly guest,  
 To glad the meeting, down will haste ;  
 And *love*, with all his smiling train,  
 Comes here from fair *Arcadia's* plain :  
 True *friendship* comes, a stranger rare,  
 And *sorrow* with dishevel'd hair ;  
 A mourning wife, but *beauty* too,  
 My Fanny comes and comes with you.  
 From *Falkirk's* Field, and healthy tomb,  
 Monro and Whitney both will come,  
 And Ker, beloved youth, will leave  
 His rest in fam'd Culloden's grave.  
 Assemblage high ! ten thousand more  
 Will croud from <sup>1</sup>*Schelda's* bloody shoar ;  
 With these a *matron*, sad, yet great,  
 The *genius* of our sinking state,  
 With thistles crown'd, they faded all  
 The morn of noble Gard'ner's fall.  
 Last *silence*, *darkness*, sisters twin,  
 At one his obsequies begin :  
 The meeting's set, betimes attend,  
 Just as the first cock crows, they end.  
 Edinburgh, Feb. 10, 1747. X.

If it were not for the note below the title we should hardly have recognized this as an imitation of Milton. Probably the poet intended to take *Lycidas* as his model, but found the project beyond his powers. However that may be, the interest of the poem to the modern reader will be found in the strong resemblance of the opening lines, after the first two, to Collins's *Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746*. I quote the whole poem, as it is very short, for comparison :

How sleep the brave who sink to rest  
 By all their country's wishes blest !  
 When Spring, with dewy fingers cold,  
 Returns to deck their hallow'd mold,  
 She there shall dress a sweeter sod  
 Than Fancy's feet have ever trod.

By fairy hands their knell is rung,  
 By forms unseen their dirge is sung ;  
 There Honour comes, a pilgrim grey,  
 To bless the turf that wraps their clay ;  
 And Freedom shall awhile repair,  
 To dwell a weeping hermit there.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fontenoy [author's note].

Collins's poem, which I will call for convenience *How sleep the brave*, was first published late in December, 1746, in his *Odes on several Descriptive and Allegorical Subjects*. If, therefore, we are to place reliance on the date at the foot of the longer poem, which I will call *Colonel Gardiner*, we must be content to suppose that the case is one of simple plagiarism. It is very likely, however, that the date was added by the editor at the moment of going to press. The same date, except for an obvious misprint which throws it back a century, is assigned to another poem, of still greater interest to students of Collins, also appearing in the February number of the *British Magazine*, and evidently by the same author. It is difficult to believe that both were composed from beginning to end on the same day, though they may well have been finally revised on that day and sent together to the printer.

In the second poem just mentioned, the *Ode to Evening*, the influence of Collins would easily be recognized even if it were not proclaimed by the title. The first stanza, after the first two lines, resembles the second stanza of the familiar *Ode to Evening*; then follows a stanza which recalls clearly though faintly the closing lines of both the *Ode on the Poetical Character* and the *Ode to Pity*; this again is followed by three stanzas which, with allowance for the effect of a different metre, resemble Collins's *Ode to Evening* almost as closely as *Colonel Gardiner* resembles *How sleep the brave*. After that the tones of Collins are heard no more. Here is the poem to the full extent of its regrettable length :

*An ODE TO EVENING,  
In Imitation of Milton.*

I.

Evening, thou Nymph divine and holy,  
Devout, demure, and melancholy ;  
Oh teach me, gentle maid,  
In pensive strains to tell my tale,  
Soft as the breathings of the gale  
That fans thy sleeping shade.

II.

Full on yon heaving billow's breast  
His head reclin'd, eyes sunk in rest :  
I view the falling light.  
With him, the wakeful pleasures fly  
To climes, where day ne'er shuts his eye,  
Nor dreads the sullen night.



## III.

But now, thy folding dewy star,  
 Its pale circlet shews from far,  
 To warn the dapper elves  
 That slept in rose-buds all day long,  
 Or lurk'd amidst the sun-beams throng,  
 To haunt the lawns and shelves.

## IV.

And many a nymph who sheds her brows  
 With Sedge-leaves dipt in freshning dews,  
 Now leave their wet abode.  
 But church-yards drear, and lonely shores,  
 The lated traveller abhors,  
 And takes a safer road.

## V.

Then let me rove some healthy scene,  
 Where glaring ruin sits between,  
 And tomb-stones shew their head ;  
 Where o'er a grave, some plaintive ghost  
 Bewails a life untimely lost,  
 And charms the list'ning dead.<sup>1</sup>

## VI.

In days now past, sure days of yore,  
 When mankind own'd religion's pow'r,  
 Nor scorn'd a Saviour's sway ;  
 God's praise, with morning light begun,  
 And when the ev'ning bell was rung,  
 It sooth'd the twilight gray.

## VII.

But now, forgotten and forlorn,  
 With eyes enflam'd, the flushed morn  
 Sees rebel mortals rise.  
 Nor Night, in all her brown array,  
 Can bend the stubborn heart to pray,  
 Or learn them to be wise.

## VIII.

But soon a midnight trump shall blow,  
 And bid the sheeted dead, below,  
 Awake and meet their doom :  
 A midnight, ah ! how blank and drear,  
 To him who never pour'd a pray'r,  
 Nor begg'd a Saviour's boon.

*Edin. Feb. 10, 1647 (sic).*

X.

<sup>1</sup> The "ruin," with its accompaniments, disappeared from Collins's poem in the course of revision, but had been conspicuously present in the earliest version. Lines 29-32 originally read :

Then let me rove some wild and healthy scene,  
 Or find some ruin midst its dreary dells,  
 Whose walls more awful nod  
 By thy religious gleams.

Collins's *Ode to Evening* was first published in the volume which included *How sleep the brave* among its other contents, so that here again the most obvious explanation will be simple plagiarism; but we must take account of the internal evidence, which leads us to believe that the rimed version came first. Though the influence of Milton upon the familiar *Ode to Evening* is perceptible in some scattered phrases, no one would think of describing the poem as a whole as "in imitation of Milton"<sup>1</sup>; the rimed ode is quite fairly and justly so described, and seems, as we read it to-day, to look with equal clearness before and after, backward to Milton and forward to Collins. A plagiarist who could take up this intermediate position must have had extraordinary insight and ingenuity. One example of the difficulty will serve as an illustration. It is apparent to modern research, but by no means obvious to the casual reader, that the "folding-star" of Collins's *Ode* was suggested by the first line of a speech in *Comus*: "The star that bids the shepherd fold." Are we to suppose that the plagiarist, who must have been one of the earliest readers of the poem, promptly perceived this indebtedness and added "dapper elves," which Collins does not mention, from the continuation of the same speech? The evidence of the date is far too slender a support for that improbability.

It may be useful to offer a conjecture in the hope that some part of it, subject to modification in matters of detail, may survive criticism. It is designed to bring the principal facts mentioned so far into relation with some others already known.

It is apparent that *Colonel Gardiner* was composed not earlier than April 16, 1746, as it has an allusion to the death of Lord Robert Kerr at the Battle of Culloden. We learn from his *Autobiography* that Alexander Carlyle was in London from "the end of February or the beginning of March"<sup>2</sup> of that year till the middle of May.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. E. G. Ainsworth (*Poor Collins*, p. 144) says that the *Ode to Evening* "abounds with reminiscences of Milton," and demonstrates the fact by a minute analysis. He finds numerous verbal parallels up to line 34, after which, he says (p. 148), "the borrowings are not so direct." He might, according to his own evidence, have gone farther, and said that there are no unquestionable borrowings in the rest of the poem, for two or three "favourite Miltonic adjectives" and "compounds in the Miltonic manner" do not prove anything.

It is obvious and significant that line 34 of Collins's ode corresponds almost exactly to the point in the rimed ode (see the end of stanza V), where the Miltonic influence ceases. It is hardly less obvious that at this point the influence of Collins upon the rimed ode also disappears.

<sup>2</sup> *Autobiography*, ed. Burton (1910), p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

During this time he met Smollett, Thomson, Armstrong, and Andrew Millar, the publisher, among other "literary people", and it is very likely that Collins was one of those not mentioned by name. He also "dined frequently with a club of officers, mostly Scotch, at a coffeehouse at Church Court in the Strand", where he met "Captain Henry Fletcher, Boyd Porterfield, and sundry more who had been spared at the fatal battle of Fontenoy."<sup>1</sup> According to the best evidence it was at the same period—the month of May 1746—that Collins composed his ode in memory of Captain Charles Ross, one of the heroes of Fontenoy.<sup>2</sup> It seems very doubtful, from the circumstances of his life, whether Collins could ever have met Captain Ross, and the doubt is strengthened by his mistake about the hero's rank<sup>3</sup> and by the strictly impersonal tone of the whole poem. All this is consistent with the supposition that Collins first heard of Ross from the talk of Carlyle and his military friends. It will be convenient here, before venturing further upon the perils of speculation, to call upon two more facts for support. The first is that the metre of the rimed *Ode to Evening* is the same as that of Collins's *On the Death of Colonel Ross*, and is, in fact, one which Collins frequently employed. Secondly, the ode *On the Death of Colonel Ross* was afterwards published in full, following the earlier of the two known texts, in the *British Magazine* for July 1746, the number which contains *Fannie Weeping*.

If we allow the assumption that Collins and Carlyle met in London about the time of Culloden, and discovered a common interest in poetry, we may imagine the course of events to have been something like this. Excited by the news from Scotland and by the talk about Fontenoy and other battles, Carlyle produced his *Fannie Weeping* and showed it to Collins. Collins, interested but critical,

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography*, pp. 204-5.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Mr. A. S. P. Woodhouse for the privilege of seeing in manuscript an essay on Collins written some time ago, in which he argues strongly and, I think, convincingly in favour of 1746 as the year of the momentous meeting between Collins and Warton at Guildford Races, when Warton first saw the ode *On the Death of Colonel Ross*. As Mr. Woodhouse's work is not yet published I cannot cite it as authoritative; but it may be sufficient to say that Mr. H. O. White suggests May 1746 as the date of Warton's letter to his brother describing the meeting (*R.E.S.*, vol. VI, p. 440).

<sup>3</sup> Charles Ross, of the Scots Guards, killed at Fontenoy, never attained a higher rank than that of Captain, and is correctly described as Captain in the notice of his death in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (XV. 276). See *History of the Scots Guards*, by Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, I. 140 and II. 354. Some interesting details of Ross's career, from contemporary sources, will be found in *Old Ross-shire and Scotland from Tain and Balnagown Documents*, edited by William MacGill.

suggested that the heroine's father, Colonel Gardiner, would be a fine subject for an elegy on the model of *Lycidas*, and dashed off a few lines to show how it could be done. A little later Collins composed his tribute to the memory of Captain Ross, whose name he would have heard mentioned frequently by the Scottish survivors of Fontenoy.<sup>1</sup> By this time, we may suppose, Carlyle's circle, strongly influenced by Smollett and his *Tears of Scotland*, was beginning to realize the horrors which had followed Cumberland's victory, and whatever poetic inspiration had been aroused was directed to more congenial themes. Carlyle, borrowing the metre of the ode *On the Death of Colonel Ross*, attempted an ambitious imitation of *Il Penseroso*, but found himself in difficulties at an early stage. Collins then suggested that more inspiration might be had from *Comus*, and wrote the third, fourth and fifth stanzas with little or no help from the nominal author.

I suggest that to these imaginary scenes,

which, daring to depart  
From sober truth, are still to nature true,

we may trace the origin of Collins's *Ode to Evening* and *How sleep the brave*. We know that Carlyle returned to Scotland about the middle of May, to undergo the final tests for his admission to the Presbyterian ministry. The moment would not be propitious to announce himself in the character of an original poet, and his mind would be occupied with weightier matters; but the appearance in Edinburgh the following year of a new periodical, the *British Magazine*, would afford him a tempting opportunity to see himself in print. Collins,

<sup>1</sup> This, I think, is not seriously in conflict with the traditional story, according to which Collins was attracted to a certain Miss Elizabeth Goddard, who had been engaged to Captain Ross. Collins may have been introduced to Miss Goddard in London by some friend who had known Captain Ross; and that supposition brings us back at once to Carlyle and his circle.

The apparent difficulty is in the assumption that Miss Goddard belonged to the village of Harting, in Sussex, because of the mention of "humble Harting's cottag'd vale" in the last stanza of the poem. This, as Harting is very near the coast, may mean nothing more than that Ross's fame should ring through the remotest places from one end of the country to the other, from the north of Scotland to the south of England. The word *even* before *Harting*, read in that way, becomes intelligible; it hardly is so if we suppose that Harting had special reasons of its own for mourning Ross's death. The people who have searched the parish records of Harting for traces of the lady in question must be counted by the dozen, but none has ever been rewarded. H. D. Gordon (*History of Harting*, pp. 165-9) thinks Miss Goddard's association with the village probable, but does not give any evidence worth considering. Another book which ought to afford information, if any were to be had, is *Goddard Wills*, by R. W. K. Goddard, consisting of abstracts of the wills left by persons of this name from the earliest times to the nineteenth century.

in the meantime, had published his *Ode to Evening* and *How sleep the brave* among his own poems. We must assume that he was justified in taking back his gift, if his contribution to the anonymous poems is to be so regarded, as we do not know what arrangement the major and the minor poet may have reached when they parted company. If, as seems very probable, it was at Carlyle's suggestion that Collins's ode *On the Death of Colonel Ross* was printed in the *British Magazine* for July, there cannot have been any interruption of friendly relations.

I am aware that much of what has been said in this article is merely speculative, but I hope that I have not engaged in the kind of speculation which leaves the facts entirely out of sight.

## WAS COLERIDGE THE AUTHOR OF THE "ENQUIRER" SERIES IN THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, 1796-9?

By DOROTHY COLDICUTT

THE only unsigned reviews hitherto identified as Coleridge's occur in the *Critical Review*, but can most conveniently be consulted in the appendix to Garland Greever's life of Bowles: *A Wiltshire Parson and his Friends*.<sup>1</sup> Their identification was made possible by the discovery of a manuscript letter from Coleridge to Bowles *circa* March 1797. Neither Greever nor any other worker on Coleridge has investigated further, though the nature and scope of the work to be done is clearly indicated in two passages, also quoted by Greever, from the *Letters*.<sup>2</sup>

I receive about forty guineas yearly from the *Critical Review* and the new *Monthly Magazine*. It is hard if by my greater works I do not get twenty more (*Letters*, I. 185, December 12, 1796).

. . . My means of maintaining them—Eighty pounds from Charles Lloyd, and forty from the Review and Magazine. . . . Lloyd intreated me to give up the Review and Magazine, and devote the evenings to him, but this would be to give up a permanent for a temporary situation (*Letters*, I. 189).

And again :

My evenings I shall devote to literature ; and, by reviews, the magazine, and the other shilling-scamper employments, shall probably gain forty pounds a year (*Letters*, I. 194(i), December 17, 1796).

A letter to Charles Lloyd senior at the same period contains the unequivocal statement that "my evenings will be fully occupied in fulfilling my engagements with the *Critical Review* and the *New Monthly Magazine*."

The salary is evidently subject to slight fluctuation, according

<sup>1</sup> *The Correspondence of William Lisle Bowles. Together with Four Hitherto Unidentified Reviews by Coleridge*, edited by Garland Greever, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, 1895. Hereafter referred to as *Letters*.

with services received, but there is no doubt that there was a salary, and that Coleridge had begun his career as a "hireling".

All through his life Coleridge was interested in reviews and magazines, being preacher and teacher by nature and conviction, and desiring that his voice should carry as far as possible. Lack of money was often an additional urge. So as early as 1794 he was "scrawling a few guineas' worth of nonsense" for the booksellers (*Letters*, I. 84, September 1794, to Southey), and from March to May 1796 was editing and publishing his own unsuccessful periodical the *Watchman*, after having failed to gain employment in the *Citizen*.<sup>1</sup> The envoi to the *Watchman* gives as the causes of its lack of popularity the superior excellence of Flower's *Cambridge Intelligencer* and the new *Monthly Magazine*, "a Work, which has almost monopolized the talents of the Country," and which "teaches RATIONAL LIBERTY, . . . strengthening the intellect by SCIENCE, and softening our affections by the GRACES!" Flower was Coleridge's friend, but the character of Phillips must always have been antipathetic. The third number of the *Watchman* is enough to prove that Coleridge's indebtedness to Phillips was not only that to a friend of humanity, but also to a proprietor of a magazine.

The second article, on Ireland's pretended discovery of new Shakespearian manuscripts, coincides almost exactly with a similar article in the *Monthly Magazine* for February 1796,<sup>2</sup> while the fifth article, on the origin of the maypole, can be found word for word in the same number.<sup>3</sup> Coleridge had evidently come to some arrangement with Phillips which allowed him to use articles, sometimes with and sometimes without acknowledgment.<sup>4</sup>

The magazine, as well as being a source of articles for Coleridge's periodical, was the repository of his friends' work. It has contributions from Thelwall, Dyer, Dr. Beddoes, Southey, Lamb, and Lloyd. When one of these found a good thing, whether book or poem or liberal periodical, he usually shared his knowledge with the

<sup>1</sup> *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* . . . ed. E. L. Griggs, 1932: I. 33-4, January 1795, to Dyer.

<sup>2</sup> *Watchman*, pp. 68-72; *Monthly Magazine*, I. 42, February 1796.

<sup>3</sup> *Watchman*, pp. 76-7; *Monthly Magazine*, I. 29. The only differences are in punctuation.

<sup>4</sup> The monthly report for agriculture, quoted in the April *Watchman*, is acknowledged. The *Monthly Magazine* was also of aid to Coleridge in his accounts of domestic occurrences and of foreign politics, though he had some additional source for the latter.



others, for their profit. That these men wrote for the magazine would encourage a strong presumption that Coleridge was also a contributor. But there is no need for presumptions: we have evidence, in two signed poems,<sup>1</sup> a signed letter,<sup>2</sup> and the three Nehemiah Higginbotham sonnets.<sup>3</sup>

This is promising, but it is not enough. It affords further evidence of a close connection between Coleridge and the *Monthly Magazine*, but one does not receive a salary of £20 a year for five poems and a letter.

Coleridge's position on the *Critical Review* was that of novel-reviewer. The *Monthly Magazine* paid little attention to this department of literature, its notices being perfunctory and usually caustic. On the other hand, it laid emphasis on its documentation—its reports on agriculture, science, politics, etc.—and on its “original communications which convey new and authentic information about matters of fact, important to the progress of useful knowledge, and tending to ameliorate the condition of mankind” (Preface to vol. v). Increased knowledge and the propagation of liberal principles were its aims. They were Coleridge's too, with this slight but increasing difference, that whereas the magazine tended to regard the accumulation of information as peculiarly its province and as making in itself for the amelioration of mankind, Coleridge came to concern himself less with accumulation and more with interpretation, less with material improvement and more with moral progress. In 1796 he was still satisfied with Phillips' programme.

The first number of the *Monthly Magazine* appeared in February 1796. It opens with a large section of original contributions (usually in the form of letters) which, in this and subsequent issues, reach a high standard individually and collectively. Occasionally there is a series of articles. One of these begins on page 2 of the first number, and thereafter continues regularly until July 1797 and irregularly until January 1822. It is called the “Enquirer”

<sup>1</sup> “On a late Connubial Rapture in High Life” (*Monthly Magazine*, 1. 647); “Reflections on entering into active life” (*ibid.*, 732).

<sup>2</sup> Replying to other letters criticizing Coleridge's *Monody*.

<sup>3</sup> III. 374. Coleridge was also thinking of selling the *Ancient Mariner* to Phillips (Griggs, 1. 90, January 1798; *ibid.*, 1. 92, January 6, 1798). The fewness of these contributions is accounted for by the low price of poetry in the *Monthly* (it was paid as prose), and by the considerations that Coleridge was still contributing an occasional poem to the *Cambridge Intelligencer*, and that after December 7, 1797, his poems that appeared in periodicals were diverted to the *Morning Chronicle*.

series, and it contains unusually interesting material, even for the *Monthly Magazine*.

These are the articles which the Enquirer contributed to the *Monthly Magazine* before 1800 :

- No. 1. Ought the freedom of enquiry to be restricted ? (Feb. 1796).
- No. 2. Is it desirable that the State should interfere in the education of youth ? (Mar. 1796).
- No. 3. Are literary and scientific pursuits suited to the female charatcer ? (Apr. 1796).
- No. 4. Is private affection inconsistent with universal benevolence ? (May 1796).
- No. 5. What has been the probable origin of idolatry ? (June 1796).
- No. 6. Is verse essential to poetry ? (July 1796).
- No. 7. Is the funding system consistent with justice and sound policy ? (Aug. 1796).
- No. 8. Wherein do the present modes of popular instruction admit of improvement ? (Sept. 1796).
- No. 9. Ought sensibility to be cherished, or repressed ? (Oct. 1796).
- No. 10. Is mankind advancing towards perfection ? (Dec. 1796).
- No. 11. Ought error, in any case, to be designedly propagated ? (Feb. 1797).
- No. 12. Is rhyme an ornament, or a defect, in verse ? (Apr. 1797).
- No. 13. Whence arises diversity of opinion ? (July 1797).
- No. 14. What has been the probable origin of the notion of personal plurality in the divine nature ? (Sept. 1797).
- No. 15. What is education ? (Mar. 1798).
- No. 16. In what degree is the future amelioration of the state of mankind probable ? (Jan. 1799).
- No. 17. What is the constitutional freedom of the press in England, and how may it best be preserved ? (May 1799).

The first point is the title. Here we have the Enquirer: Coleridge has previously figured as the Watchman, and will later assume the role of Friend to humanity. These semi-dramatic roles were meat and drink to him : it is to be noted how conscious the author is of himself as Enquirer after truth.<sup>1</sup> The title may have been suggested by Godwin's *Enquiry into Political Justice* (1793), which Coleridge had read repeatedly and was at this time intending to confute.

When we approach the articles more closely we find that each is furnished with one or more mottoes, apparently selected with care. Coleridge admitted to Estlin, in December 1796<sup>2</sup> : " You know I

<sup>1</sup> *Monthly Magazine*, I. 2, 18 ; III. 273 ; IV. 15. Cf. *Watchman*, Nos. I and 10.

<sup>2</sup> H. A. Bright : *Unpublished letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge to the Rev. John Prior Estlin* (published in *Miscellanies of the Philobiblion Society*, vol. 15, 1884, p. 27).

am a *mottophilist* and almost a *motto-manist*—I love an apt motto to my heart." This love of an apt motto reaches its apotheosis in the *Friend*, where the mottoes often fill the whole first page of each essay, and in the *Aids to Reflection*, which could be described as a series of mottoes with comments appended. The Enquirer's range is not as great as the *Friend*'s, but he quotes from Bishop Watson, Adam Smith, Plutarch, Knox, Pope, Swift, Thomson, Dr. Aikin, Virgil, Akenside, Butler, Terence, and Burnet. Most of these names can be traced in Coleridge's reading. It is impracticable to comment on them all: I shall choose one only. A quotation from Akenside furnishes the motto for Enquirer No. 11. Akenside is also quoted in the Gutch Memorandum Book, the Bristol Addresses, and the first number of the *Watchman*; an adaptation of a passage from his poems is used as motto to the *Religious Musings* in 1796, and an early elegy is imitated from one of his blank verse inscriptions; Coleridge borrowed his *Poems* from the Bristol Library from December 24 to January 6, 1795-6; and, finally, there are references in the *Letters*.<sup>1</sup>

The range of reading is still more noteworthy in the body of the text, and those who disagree with the ascription of the Enquirer series to Coleridge have the task of finding another young man (the author of Enquirers Nos. 9 and 10 is obviously a young man) who is equally familiar with sermons, the classics, philosophical writers, contemporary poets, the Bible, literary criticism, text-books of finance and economics, and travel literature.<sup>2</sup> By consulting Coleridge's and Lamb's letters, the Gutch Memorandum Book, Livingston Lowes' *Road to Xanadu* (mainly for the travel literature), and the list of Coleridge's borrowings from the Bristol Library,<sup>3</sup> we can identify, as known to Coleridge before 1800, the greater number of the sixty-nine authors cited. To take examples: Iamblicus and Julian are among the books Coleridge commissioned Thelwall to buy<sup>4</sup>; Lamb was to have got him a Plutarch.<sup>5</sup> His interest in Mary Wollstonecraft is shown in many letters and in the Gutch

<sup>1</sup> 1. 163, 179, 218, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The nearest parallel is William Taylor of Norwich, who was older and less emotional, but who also contributed to the magazine at this time. Their subjects overlap, but are by no means identical—e.g. Taylor is not interested in sermons, nor Coleridge (at this period) in Taylor's chief subject, German literature.

<sup>3</sup> See Paul Kaufman on "The Reading of Southey and Coleridge," *Modern Philology*, vol. 21, pp. 317, February 1924.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, 1. 182; November 19, 1796.

<sup>5</sup> A. Ainger's *Letters of Charles Lamb*, 1888; 1. 28, July 1, 1796.

Memorandum Book.<sup>1</sup> In the twelfth Enquirer Mrs. Barbauld's *Ode to Spring* and Collins' *Ode to Evening* are singled out for warm and equal praise: this accords with Coleridge's early opinion of both poets<sup>2</sup> and with his predilection for quoting from living authors. Milton, Plato, Pope, Plutarch, Shakespeare, Swift, Rabelais, Sterne, and Cervantes remained favourites, and Fénelon, the chief incongruity, crops up again at the end of the *Aids to Reflection*, but it can be said with confidence that the Enquirer's reading coincides with Coleridge's before 1800 rather than with his later reading. This is important, as Coleridge kept changing pasture, and was apt to neglect old favourites for new. In poetry Akenside was forgotten and the Elizabethan dramatists and poets, particularly Drayton, drawn on for most of the mottoes to the first publication of the *Friend*, 1809-10. In prose the change is even more marked.

We have also evidence on the manner of the Enquirer's reading, and can compare it with Coleridge's. Coleridge had the habit of verifying references—as Lowes first discovered—so that one book regularly involved reading half a dozen others. In the first number of the *Monthly Magazine*, immediately following the first Enquirer, is an article on Mr. Maurice's *Indian Antiquities*. The *Watchman* has already afforded evidences of the thoroughness with which Coleridge conned the first numbers of the Magazine; and he was strongly interested in Hindoostan. The article refers to Dow's *Introductory Dissertation to the History of Hindoostan*, to *Institutes of Hindoo Laws*, and to the *Voyage de Sonnerat*. All these titles occur in the fourteenth Enquirer, cited by a man who has evidently read the books. The inference is obvious.

The same catholicity is shown in the choice of subject. Furthermore, each subject is propounded as a question, and each question is hard to answer, is worth answering, and a genuine attempt is made to answer it. He has the honesty to suggest problems that he cannot solve, as at the end of the essay on the probable origin of idolatry<sup>3</sup>: "but the moral nature of idolatry is a question of considerable difficulty, which the Enquirer refers, for the present,

<sup>1</sup> F. 76.

<sup>2</sup> An edition of Collins and Gray was among Coleridge's projected works (Gutch, ff. 21, 25; *Letters* i. 196). For Coleridge's early opinion of Mrs. Barbauld, see Griggs, i. 102, 135. Later, according to Crabb Robinson (quoted in *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, by T. M. Raysor, II. 220), he "went out of his way to insult her."

<sup>3</sup> *Monthly Magazine*, i. 374.

to the consideration of his readers." In the *Aids to Reflection* Coleridge has an answer to the problem put by the Enquirer. And how many people, in any age, are seriously concerned with the moral nature of idolatry?

Just as idolatry has to be considered in all its aspects, so has poetry, so has religion, so has education. The Enquirer finds it impossible to envisage any question in isolation. Each tends to link itself with others, or to something lying behind all the essays, and implicit in each one of them. Education, for instance, is considered from so many different angles that it is a constantly growing conception. The first essay—"Ought the freedom of enquiry to be restricted?"—is not directly on education, but the subject lies at the basis of all education, and the Enquirer knew it. There follows an essay (Enquirer No. 2) on education and the state, and another (No. 5) which is in effect a discussion on female education. The subject of Enquirer No. 8 is "Wherein do the present modes of popular instruction admit of improvement?" While that of No. 9 is, equally with No. 1, a basic question: "Ought error, in any case, to be designedly propagated?" No. 13 is less closely connected. No. 14 is "What is education?" Other groupings can be made, on the function of the state, for instance (Nos. 1, 2, 7, and others). Most noticeable is the constant pre-occupation with man's capabilities and investigation into the factors which have prevented him from realizing them. Coleridge chose, as summing up the tendency of his commonplace book, the motto "quid sumus et quid futuri gignimur—what we are, and what we are born to become."<sup>1</sup> What more natural than that he who was to concern himself in the *Friend* with the causes of error, in the *Treatise on Method* and other works with the removal of misconceptions arising from lack of system in classification and of precision in language, who in the *Friend*, the *Aids to Reflection*, and his literary and philosophical lectures endeavoured to teach men not so much what to think as how to think, should here be making his first systematic explorations into these questions. And at least we know that the progressive discouragement so noticeable in the Enquirer series<sup>2</sup> was shared by Coleridge as he came to realize that the errors against which he was struggling had their origin less in defective instruction than in qualities of human nature.

<sup>1</sup> Prospectus of the *Friend* (Bohn's edition, 387-8).

<sup>2</sup> Enquirers Nos. 1, 10, 13, 16.

The result of twentieth-century research on Coleridge has been to prove that his biographers and his friends and he himself tended to exaggerate the proportion of unrealized schemes and half-finished essays among his work. As Lowes notes, Coleridge often fulfilled his projects indirectly, as when he included in the *Ancient Mariner* much of the material gathered for his "hymns to the elements." One can say with certainty, first, that Coleridge seldom wasted any knowledge that he had attained, second that his "projected works", even if never written, were present in their main outlines in his mind. His early schemes often remained unembodied simply because he was developing so fast that the mould in which he could cast his ideas one day was completely inadequate six months after. Godwin was to have figured in the Pantisocratic manual, then in the *Watchman*, then in a six-shilling octavo, and Coleridge's emphasis is now on "all that is good in Godwin", <sup>1</sup> now on his explanation of the origin of property, <sup>2</sup> now on his attitude to morality. <sup>3</sup> The "answer to Godwin" was never written, but we have at least an approach to it in the *Enquirer* series. Godwin is only quoted twice, but he is continually in the author's mind (e.g. *Enquirer* No. 4); and most of the questions in the essays had already been dealt with in *Political Justice*. The *Enquirer* begins where Godwin begins: "Perfectability is one of the most unequivocal characteristics of the human species." <sup>4</sup> There Godwin stayed: not so the *Enquirer*, or Coleridge.

One ought to mention the *Enquirer's* attitude to morality and religion. Religion is held so important that the eighth *Enquirer*, which has for its subject "Wherein do the present Modes of Popular Instruction admit of Improvement?" concerns itself mainly with suggestions for the improvement of preaching. <sup>5</sup> The subjects suggested for "regular Courses of lectures on religious and moral subjects" <sup>6</sup> are Coleridgean, as is the suggestion that sermons should be enlivened with citations from the poets, aphorisms, parables, and "historical or biographical anecdotes, illustrative of moral sentiments." <sup>7</sup> Coleridge thought as the *Enquirer* did about

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, I. 91; to Southey, October 21, 1794.

<sup>2</sup> Griggs, I. 59-60; to Thelwall, November 13, 1796.

<sup>3</sup> Griggs, I. 65; to Benjamin Flower, December 1796.

<sup>4</sup> *Political Justice*, II. One would welcome a properly documented essay on Godwin and Coleridge.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Griggs, I. 60; *Letters*, I. 103.

<sup>6</sup> *Monthly Magazine*, II, 706.

<sup>7</sup> A glance through the *Friend* will show that in 1809 Coleridge used all these



national morality, about the value of the domestic sentiments,<sup>1</sup> about the value of sensibility. The essay on sensibility<sup>2</sup> is just what we should expect from a Coleridge pleading his own case, and refusing to admit that it is a weak one.<sup>3</sup> Since this essay is the most self-revealing of the seventeen, and also the one which presents fewest connections with the rest, it will be well to pause on it. Why was it written?

The argument of the essay is easily given. The Enquirer complains that the members of the modern and "vulgar" tribe of stoics are inclined to look down with a contemptuous sneer on those whose weak souls "melt in tender sympathy at sorrows not their own" (Godwin was one of these vulgar stoics). They are, of course, wrong. Excessive sensibility is dangerous and affected sensibility despicable, but genuine sensibility is eminently valuable, whether in the arts, in morals, or in social intercourse.

This is perhaps the most typical passage:

The value of sensibility is best seen in the most trying situations. Who would not wish for generous tenderness, as well as honour and integrity, in the friend to whom he should bequeath the important charge of guarding the property and the innocence, and superintending the education, of his orphan children? . . . On the bed of sickness, what is there, next to conscious innocence—*mens sibi conscia recti*—so consolatory as the presence of a friend, whose sensibility will prompt him to listen with attention to your "tale of symptoms," and to prevent your wants by kind assiduities? (*Monthly Magazine*, II. 709).

In the last months of 1796, when this was published, Charles Lloyd was living with Coleridge. As Lloyd had even more sensibility than his host, and was in addition subject to fits, he might well have caused Coleridge to reconsider the value of sensibility, a question which his relationship with Poole, a kind-hearted man but of insufficient sensibility, had already raised.<sup>4</sup> If the orphan children in the passage quoted are not Coleridge's, then he never had any. His letters and poems are well supplied with anticipations of his own death and the consequent misery of his wife and

devices to make his truths palatable. Cf. also *Letters from the Lake Poets* . . . compiled by Miss M. Stuart, 1889, I. 117.

<sup>1</sup> In particular Enquirer No. 4, but see also Nos. 3, 9, and 15.

<sup>2</sup> Enquirer No. 9, October 1796.

<sup>3</sup> *Anima Poetae*, p. 195, contains a similar example of special pleading.

<sup>4</sup> Lloyd would of course be to Coleridge a case of "excessive," as he himself of "genuine," sensibility. Poole's attitude to Coleridge's sensibility is indicated sufficiently by the one reference, Mrs. Sandford's *Thomas Poole and his Friends*, 1888, II, 117.



children, or alternatively—for a luxuriating sensibility can both eat its cake and have it—of anticipations of the deaths of his friends and his children and his own consequent misery. He was continually writing his own epitaph, and one of his chief grievances was that his friends refused to “listen with attention to his ‘tale of symptoms.’”

Let us add that the Enquirer is almost certainly a Non-conformist, that he has an exaggerated horror of immorality (No. 12), that he is a believer in “principles,” and has studied the problem of the Trinity (No. 14),<sup>1</sup> that he is against the reading of sermons (No. 8), and that he looks forward (No. 4) to a “project of an universal character, in which the present ambiguities of language should be avoided, and all the varieties of human ideas should be correctly presented, and classically arranged.”

Consideration of the style of the essays leads to the same conclusions. It recalls Milton and the seventeenth-century prose writers whom Coleridge took as his models. Perhaps the best comparison is with the preface to “Fire, Famine, and Slaughter,” since Coleridge considered this to be his most perfect piece of prose. The Enquirers have not attained its ease, but they show the same love of balance, of antithesis, of elaborate metaphors and personifications, and of a closely knit logical structure. The Enquirer is as fond as Coleridge was of rhetorical questions: one of his tricks is to exaggerate his opponents’ arguments, throw them between inverted commas, and then triumphantly demolish them.<sup>2</sup> Coleridge never misses an opportunity for complicated personification: neither does the Enquirer. Knowledge (No. 3) has to be a tree, which “planted by the hand of nature, in an open plain, invites every passenger to partake of its bounty; and man, instead of rudely hedging it round with thorns, to deter the approach of woman, ought to assist her in plucking the fruit from those branches which may happen to hang above her reach.” Lamb laughs at this tendency in Coleridge, and brings the medicine of delicate exaggeration: “Still that Richardson remaineth—a thorn in the side of Hope, when she would lean towards Stowey.”<sup>3</sup> But the Enquirer has done his best to curb a tendency towards emotional language and garish figures: he is a contributor to a magazine, and his contributions must not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Biographia Literaria*, Ch. 10, Bohn’s edition, p. 81 (“For I was at that time and long after, though a Trinitarian (i.e. ad normam Platonis) in philosophy, yet a zealous Unitarian in religion”). This fits the Enquirer exactly.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Godwin.

<sup>3</sup> *Ainger*, i. 76; letter to Coleridge, 1797.

pass certain limits, emotional, intellectual, and textual. As long as his feelings are not involved he fulfils the conditions admirably. Take away that restraint and we have, not, certainly, the manchineel tree and the Mexican deity Tescalipoca, those favourites of an earlier date, but still a galaxy of metaphors that makes choice difficult. I select one which shows that, distressing as such metaphors are, they have their origin in genuine perceptiveness: "With the vast weight of care which crushes the shoulders of a minister in time of war, it would surely be unreasonable to expect, that he should lift up his head to look forward to distant consequences" (*Monthly Magazine*, II. 535). To most the "vast weight of care" is merely a cliché. This man has visualized it.

The most effective metaphors are taken from the sciences, particularly chemistry and optics. In the fourth Enquirer a parallel is instituted between chemical attractions which subsist between different classes of bodies "and yet operate without interfering with the universal laws of gravitation," and the "dear charities of private life" which "may remain, without violating the supreme law which unites man to man, and being to being, throughout the universe." Elsewhere (I. 94) high patronage is compared to "a large convex lens" which "cannot fail to collect into its focus, numerous rays." Coleridge was also interested in optics and chemistry. "Of useful knowledge, I am a so-so chemist, and I love chemistry" (*Letters*, I. 181). The fifteenth Enquirer has a metaphor which only Coleridge would dare, a comparison between insensible education and insensible perspiration. And medicine was Coleridge's other scientific interest, even from his school years.

The ascription of the series to Coleridge must rest on such evidence as this, rather than the assembling of parallel passages. As soon as Coleridge's mind was mature, and his opinions in their main outlines fixed, he became addicted to quotation and adaptation from his own previous work, but only work falling within that period. At the time of these articles his opinions, and to a lesser extent his style, were unformed: it would be natural that we should find in his later works as few echoes from his unsigned reviews and articles as from the *Watchman*. And in fact, such parallels are small; but they are not few, and they are reassuringly varied. The use of "arts" in Enquirer No. 2 to describe reading, writing, and arithmetic (compare the first article in the *Watchman*) and "useful art" to describe agriculture in Enquirer No. 2 (compare Coleridge's later

distinction between the arts, sciences, and scientific arts, in his work on method) is not a verbal cliché, but the reflection of a way of thinking, evidenced also by the introduction of "rights and duties" in conjunction with each other in Enquirers Nos. 8 and 10, as in all Coleridge's signed works. The figures of truth as a luminary (No. 11) and of a stream running from a man's lips (No. 15—compare the *Friend*, end of essay 3, First Landing Place) are recurrent in Coleridge; so is the distinction made between esoteric and exoteric doctrine (e.g. Nos. 1 and 11). "Shackled" (No. 16) is a favourite word, while "amusive" (No. 16) in the sense of aiming at amusement is noted in the *N.E.D.*, with an example taken from Coleridge's *Friend*. "Fetish" was also rare at this period: the Enquirer italicizes it in the consciousness of its rarity and foreign origin, and uses the spelling "fetiche" (No. 5). It occurs also in the *Statesman's Manual*,<sup>1</sup> and in the *Friend*, three times and in edition IV similarly italicized, with the spelling "fetisch." Both these spellings are early variants of "fetish," and Coleridge's spelling was erratic. There is also the phrase "stock of ideas" (or, similarly, of improvement, or materials, or industry—Nos. 3, 7, 10, 13), a favourite of both Coleridge and Wordsworth. Another parallel with Wordsworth is the "It is so" of No. 15, which T. S. Eliot found so exhilarating, the comment on Aristotle in the Lyrical Ballads Preface. When two men are constantly together, and in sympathy, they contract each other's mannerisms. Such echoes are trifling in themselves, but they have a cumulative importance.

It is interesting to compare the subjects and data of the Enquirer essays with the record of Coleridge's borrowings from the Bristol Library, and with his known contributions to the *Critical Review*. I have mentioned the possible use of Akenside. Again, Coleridge took out Foster "On Accent and Quantity" from December 13, 1796, to March 9, 1797. The April Enquirer is on the question whether rhyme is an ornament or a defect in verse. Two months earlier Coleridge had made use of Foster in his preparation of the article on Horsley in the *Critical Review* (vol. 19, 139-44, February 1797). Surely, this is beyond coincidence.

Then there is payment. Coleridge reckoned on about forty guineas a year from the *Monthly* and the *Critical*. We happen to know what William Taylor received for certain of his poems and articles, and so can reckon the rate of payment. For a paper on

<sup>1</sup> 1816. Bohn's edition of the *Biographia Literaria*, 334.

Modern Jesuitism, of the same length as an average Enquirer, Taylor received £1 13s. 6d.<sup>1</sup> This agrees with Southey's five guineas for four sheets, i.e. "sixteen closely written pages."<sup>2</sup> The Enquirers began by appearing regularly every month. Twelve times £1 13s. 6d. is £20 2s.—almost the exact amount Coleridge was calculating on for his mysterious contributions to the *Monthly Magazine*.

The articles appear regularly every month until December, 1796, and continue at longer intervals, but still comparatively regularly, until September 1797. For 1798 is only one article, for 1799 two. This agrees with the evidence given in the letters of the falling off of Coleridge's interest in both "shilling-scavenging" and the *Monthly Magazine*; and by January 1798 he is no longer reckoning on the forty guineas as an item of his income (Griggs, I. 196). His opinion of Phillips had also changed: by 1800 he is usually "the fellow," "that fellow," "that good-for-nothing fellow." One of the reasons for this is that Coleridge had entered into relations with Phillips as publisher, had indeed received £25 "on the score of a work to be due for him—which I could do indeed in a fortnight and receive £25 more; but the fellow's name is become so infamous, that it would be worse than any thing I have yet done to appear in public as his Hack."<sup>3</sup> Before the end of the month Coleridge had repaid the £25 "in consequence of an attorney's letter, the (first I) received and which annoyed me infinitely. I felt like a man of this world. I had irritated P. by an exceedingly humorous letter, which I will send you."<sup>4</sup>

One would like to know exactly what had passed between Coleridge and Phillips, and for how long this rupture had been preparing. References in the *Monthly Magazine* to Coleridge's works, which had been laudatory or at the least indulgent, become after 1801 caustic, even vituperative. He is denied "sound and vigorous intellectual power," and described as a comet which leaves us "in complete ignorance as to what uses his long and flicker-

<sup>1</sup> J. W. Robberds: *Life and Writings of William Taylor of Norwich*, 1843, I. 395.

<sup>2</sup> *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, ed. C. C. Southey, 1849-1850, I. 283.

<sup>3</sup> Griggs I. 167, January 7, 1801. Cf. Wordsworth to Poole, July 1801 (British Museum, Add. Mss. 35, 344, ff. 142, 143).

<sup>4</sup> British Museum, Add. Mss. 35, 344, ff. 142, 143. Marginal notes by Coleridge round a transcription for Poole of Wordsworth's letter to Fox. Cf. Griggs, I. 171, letter to Poole, February 1, 1801.

ing flame may, or ever can, be put" (vol. 46, pp. 407). The change in Coleridge's politics does not seem sufficient to account for this complete reversal of the magazine's attitude. It is noticeable that after June 1801 there are no articles which could be ascribed even tentatively to Coleridge. Enquirer No. 17 appeared in May 1799. There is no eighteenth Enquirer, and Enquirer No. 19 on "Where is the patria of romance, of rime, and of chivalry?" is by William Taylor of Norwich. Taylor received £1 13s. 6d. for it. (Robberds 1. 394). Even without this knowledge, we should have suspected the title. "Patria" is as characteristic of Taylor's vocabulary as it is uncharacteristic of Coleridge's.

If Coleridge wrote the first seventeen Enquirers—and surely there is a point at which cumulative probabilities become practical certainty—we are given the opportunity of extending our knowledge of him and of his work in these directions. They would shed light on his political, religious, poetical, and personal views between 1796 and 1800—the period during which he was most fully alive and was developing most rapidly, the period, too, about which least is known by his biographers and commentators. I instance in particular the importance of knowing what had been Coleridge's thoughts on poetry before he came into contact with Wordsworth. For example, the Enquirers would corroborate Crabb Robinson's assertion that the distinction between fancy and imagination originated with Wordsworth. The Enquirer, like Addison, uses the terms indiscriminately. The two papers on poetry (Enquirers No. 6 and 12) were written and published before June 1797, when Coleridge visited William and Dorothy at Racedown in Dorset.

They would show that Coleridge's works on Godwin and Pantisocracy, though they never appeared in book form, were not as nebulous as has been supposed.

They would show that, before the end of the eighteenth century, he had discovered a basis for much of his philosophy, which he extended and elaborated during the fifty years of the nineteenth. Already in 1797 Coleridge insists on the importance of principles, on the necessity of feeling a truth as well as knowing it, on happiness as a criterion of usefulness, on the necessity for squaring our conclusions with "common sense." This is only to touch on the fringe of the subject.

They would afford material towards a more comprehensive study of Coleridge in relation to periodical literature. In time they

help to fill the gap between the *Watchman* and the *Friend*, and in scope they show interesting likenesses to and no less interesting differences from Coleridge's own periodicals, and his other known contributions to journalism and periodical literature.

Perhaps also they may lead to a revival of interest in the *Monthly Magazine*, which has been undeservedly neglected. Phillips, its editor, was astute enough to give the public exactly what it wanted, so that his paper came to fill, among magazines, the proud position that the *Edinburgh* held among reviews. Founded in 1796, the *Monthly Magazine* already, at its inception, belongs rather to the nineteenth century than the eighteenth. It merits study. And Phillips knew how to attract able writers to his banner. On this count, too, it merits study.

#### POSTSCRIPT ON THE ENQUIRER SERIES AFTER 1799

The subsequent history of the series is a troubled one. It had been popular enough for Phillips to wish to continue it, but he could find no one suitable, or no one willing. William Taylor supplied infrequent articles on philosophical and general topics<sup>1</sup>; at least one article was written by an Irishman who may have been George Gregory<sup>2</sup>; from 1806 to 1809 George Cumberland (friend of Blake, and cousin of the dramatist Richard Cumberland) furnished a series on the fine arts in England; then, after a break of eight years between 1811 and 1819, the series recommenced with miscellaneous articles, unsigned, or signed D.D. or H.R.; and finally Phillips took it over himself under the name of the *Philosophical Enquirer*, and aired his views on the nature of motion, the tides, and the economy of animal nature. My ascription of the first seventeen *Enquirers* to one writer is strengthened by the fact that Phillips begins his new series with a return to the old numbering, as if all the period between had been an interlude. His first article is headed the *Philosophical Enquirer*, No. 18. The last *Enquirer*, which is unsigned, and appears in January 1822, is on the comparative merits of Pope and Boileau.

<sup>1</sup> On Berkeley's defence of idealism, on the effects of the Reformation, the identity of Sesostris, etc. A complete list can be compiled from Robberds.

<sup>2</sup> *Enquirer* No. 25, August 1801: on hereditary virtue. The author tells us specifically that he is an Irishman. As far as I can discover, George Gregory was the only Irishman writing regularly for the *Monthly Magazine* at this date.



Between 1796 and 1800 the *Enquirer* was a connected series; after 1800 it became a chaos—in numbering, in styles, in subjects, in contributors. Where there had been lapses of months, there are now years. Anything and everything can become an *Enquirer*—a discussion of hereditary virtue, an examination into the causes of the elliptical motions of the planets, or the nature of the interior parts of the earth, or the progress of American literature. Of the men whom we know to have contributed papers, only Taylor was capable of such philosophical enquiry as the originator of the series had in mind. Phillips, who knew when not to be logical, was content that this deplorable state of affairs should continue, and we cannot doubt that the public agreed with him. It is even possible that Coleridge proved as accommodating as Phillips, and wrote further articles for the *Enquirer* after Taylor had begun to contribute to it. The paper on reasoning from analogy (February 1801) resembles his work in style and sentiments. I refer to the references to animal magnetism, to physiognomy, to the mechanistic theory of Descartes, to astrology, to Butler; and such passages as this: "Errors in science have almost uniformly been the offspring of false or imperfect analogies; and it is curious to remark how a single idea, first used by way of illustration, has engendered a whole theory, with all its appendages." The resemblance, as it is unsupported by other evidence, is not marked enough to be conclusive. After June 1801 (a little before the time of the attorney's letter) there are, as I have said, no articles which could be ascribed to Coleridge.

THE  
Hop  
Ll.1.  
being  
tive  
almo  
such  
West  
type  
Mori  
"tull  
The  
poem  
Siege  
MS.  
rectif  
Clean  
Erken  
these  
S  
Cock  
poem  
allite  
our s  
12, 1  
all th  
allite  
they  
rewri  
exam



## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### FRAGMENT OF AN ALLITERATIVE POLITICAL PROPHECY

THE fragment printed below, the knowledge of which I owe to Miss Hope Emily Allen, is on both sides of f. 129 of Ms. Camb. Univ. Ll.1.18, in a hand apparently of the late fifteenth century, one folio being missing before and one after it. It is in the non-riming alliterative metre of the fourteenth-century revival, very regular in form, almost all the lines being of the type *aaax* or *aaaa* which characterizes such poems as *Troy Book*, *Siege of Jerusalem*, and the works of the West Midland poet. The only lines which do not conform to this type are ll. 5, 8, 25, 42 (which is *aaxa*, a form found in *Gawain*, *Morte Arthur*, etc.), 14 (where "folke" is an obvious corruption of "tulke"), and 23 (where "stare" is caught from the line above). The lines divide into strophes of four, following the model of such poems as *Patience*, *Cleanness*, *Erkenwald*, *Wars of Alexander*, and *Siege of Jerusalem*, the division being in three cases indicated in the MS. The second strophe contains five lines, and this is probably rectified in ll. 40-2. Similar mistakes and corrections occur in *Cleanness*, 1541-5, 1586-90, 1591-2; 1757-66, 1791-2, and *Erkenwald*, 117-21, 150-4, 167-8 (see Sir I. Gollancz's editions of these poems and an article in *Englische Studien*, LXVI. 245-8).

Several lines are also found, though not in the same order, in *Cock in the North* (ed. Brandl, Berlin, 1909). This is an alliterative poem of eighty lines in four-line stanzas riming alternately. The alliteration is corrupt and intermittent, only twenty-one lines are of our standard type, the debased form *aabb* is frequent (e.g. ll. 7, 11, 12, 17, 20), and after l. 56 there is very little at all. The poem has all the appearance of having taken its rise from an earlier more regular alliterative poem, either the present fragment or one from which they both derive, for it is well known that prophetic poems were rewritten and revised that they might fit new circumstances. For example, stanza xii. (ll. 45-8),

All grace and godnes sall growe us amonge,  
 And ilk a fruyt have foyssoun by land and by see.  
 The spouse of Crist with iocund songe  
 Sall thanke god þarof in trinite,

begins with a regular line resembling our l. 12, after which the alliteration breaks down and it is filled out with obvious padding. Again, stanza ix (ll. 33-6),

þe fox and þe folmer in handis sall be tane  
 And to þe lion be ledde law till abide,  
 Both þe picard and þe pye sall suffre þe same  
 And all þe frendis of þe fox sall fall fra thayr pride,

gives an interesting parallel to our ll. 29, 31. L. 29 is meaningless; I would suggest that the original form was

þe fox & þe fulmard frende3 shall be tan,

(i.e. the friends of the f. and the f. shall be taken), "frende3" was then corrected in the margin by a reviser without regard for alliteration, and this gloss has got into our text in the wrong place. But the writer of the *Cock* has got the gloss in the right place, and has made another line for his stanza out of the "friends of the fox." With stanza xiv, the ascription to the standard authorities, Bridlington, Bede and Banister, Thomas and Merlin, the *Cock* appears to end, and in the last six stanzas, which certainly deal with English affairs, there is practically no alliteration and no point of contact with our fragment.

Professor Brandl takes the *Cock* to be a Northern English poem, with Hotspur for hero, the lion representing Douglas. But as R. Taylor (*The Political Prophecy in England*, Columbia University Press, 1911) points out, the lion is victorious and reigns in peace, while the cock is of no importance in the poem. Both in the *Cock* and in our fragment the hero is the lion, who has been released and rules his country in prosperity after gaining certain victories over opponents or rebels. If, according to the general practice of this type of prophecy, the lion is a Scottish king, the most suitable monarch is James I, who was "loosed out of chains" in 1424, and married Joan Beaufort, who, in the punning prophetic style, might well be described as "the mightful maiden." The next year at a "proud parliament" at Perth, James arrested and executed the Duke of Albany and two of his sons. The youngest son James escaped arrest, made a short resistance, and then fled to Ireland (see ll. 8-11).<sup>1</sup> After this, James's power was established in Scot-

<sup>1</sup> In 1429 we hear of an English attempt to get into touch with James, who was still in Ireland (Balfour-Melville: *James I, King of Scots*, p. 169).

land till the end of his reign, though, after holding his court at Inverness in 1428<sup>1</sup> to restore the peace of the Highlands, he seized Alexander, Earl of Ross and Lord of the Isles, together with some forty chiefs. Most of them were released, whereupon Ross rebelled and burnt the castle of Inverness. James marched north against him, at least some part of his army crossing to the Western Isles, and defeated him at Lochaber. He made submission to the king at Holyrood; his life was spared, but he was imprisoned. This and the previous unrest in the Highlands may be the subject of ll. 19-40, though much remains unexplained, *e.g.* why the moon, presumably one of the powers stirred up by the western wind (the Lord of the Isles) should have "had the main before." In July 1428 Princess Margaret of Scotland was betrothed to the Dauphin (*cp.* l. 24, if the reference here is to the fleur-de-lys, see the note), and if we may connect this poem with the story of James I, the date should be after this, and probably before the rebellion of Donald Balloch in 1431, as this ended in no trial.<sup>2</sup>

MS. Camb. Univ. Ll.1.18.

f. 129a. And lx : yen barons full bolde shall be brittend to dethe  
And iij knyghtes full off care kyndely destroyed

ū Betwix þ<sup>e</sup> comyng off þ<sup>e</sup> crosse & þe clere zate  
The myghtfull mayden meryly shall rise  
5 thogh þe helpe of A lyon losed owte off chynes  
And after A prowde parlement perelle3 shall falle

Then shall falsehede be flemed. & fosterd no lenger  
And þe capten þ<sup>e</sup> cowarde chese shall þe way  
And fle fast owte of þe feld þ<sup>e</sup> folke to beholde  
10 And be dryfen to desert to dwell þer for euer  
And no freke hym to folow but foster hym selfen

ū then grace shall be graunted & grow opun erthe  
All trechery. and treson be tryed full sone  
And ilke folke in þe towne haue trespere at wyll  
15 And euery burne in þe borghe bowne for to thryfe

þen plenty & pees shall put furth þer comfort  
Conciens & concord cowple shall to geder  
þe Reme in gud rewle Rest shall A. seson  
To A : westryn wynde worth all in sondre

<sup>1</sup> See Balfour-Melville, p. 165 and Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup> James I is certainly the subject of twenty lines in the first prophecy in Waldegrave's collection of 1603 (reprinted Bannatyne Club, 1833, pp. 3-4), see Taylor, *Political Prophecy*, p. 73. The prophecy is distinctly hostile to James, and the only point where it touches our fragment is on p. 4: "When the Cok crowes keepe well his come / For the Foxe and the Fulmart, they are false both." It concludes on p. 6 with a version of the *Cock*.

- 20 ū Through þ<sup>e</sup> blast off A : blaw bolne shall þ<sup>e</sup> son  
 þ<sup>e</sup> mone þat hade þe mayne before myghtyly shall ryse  
 The sterres with her stremes stare shall full brode  
 f. 129b. As Any brennand brond stare shall full wyde
- þe lyon os lylly. lappyd in gold  
 25 with a compane rered. shall ryse vpon lofte  
 Many Buryñ vpon þe bent besyly shall wake  
 Hym to please & to pay. for *perelle3* þat folow
- The moldwarpe and þe meremayden meved in mynd  
 þe fox & þe fulmard frende3 shall inhende  
 30 þe honde full vn hendely hent shall be þen  
 And led to þe lyon law to abyde
- And many questiones inquire in qualite shall be asked :  
 Why þe sonne in þe somer was sette owte of sise  
 And þe mone owt<sup>e</sup> of maner myghtfully rose  
 35 And þe sterre3 with þ<sup>e</sup> stremys staryd so brode
- Then shall þe berunes be abasched to bryng forth þer answer  
 And be redle3 of þat ronke when he þ<sup>e</sup> reson Aske3  
 And such as prowde were in prese shall put away myght  
 And beseche þat souerayn off socour as he safe wowches
- 40 With A lions loke as lord in his awne  
 he shall blussh on þe berynes þat þ<sup>e</sup> bale wrought  
 And frayne fast off þe folke qwy þay so ferden
- þen shall þe lede3 be ladde forth to þe lawe to abiden  
 what juggement þe justice will juge hem to have

1. lx : yen. I can think of no other meaning than "fifty Christian," but the metre would be very bad. In MS. Cotton Nero A.x. (reproduced by the E.E.T.S.) a similar colon is several times used as a hyphen within the line : saker : fyse, 53b/20 ; de : gre, 58a/20 ; wy3t : est, 112a/32. It is possible that this and the next line refer to some incident in the French wars of Henry V, such as the taking of Melun in 1420 or that of Meaux in 1421. At each of these James I was present. On the fall of Melun twenty Scottish mercenaries were hanged ; after Meaux Henry executed a number of the garrison, and sent three knights to Paris to be beheaded there (Monstrelet's *Chronique*, iv. 96, 1860). "Kyndely" would then mean "with due ceremony" (see its use in *Gawain*, 135), in contrast to the wholesale executions at Meaux.

3. The strophic division, marked here in the margin, denotes that this belongs to the following lines, and it apparently denotes a date, as in the opening lines of the Prophecy of Beid (*Whole Prophecy*, Bannatyne Club, p. 9),

Betwixt the cheife of summer & the said winter,  
 Before the heat of the haruest happen shall a war.

The Coming of the Cross I would interpret as Passion Sunday, when the Office Hymn is *Vexilla regis prodeunt, Fulget crucis mysterium*, and the "bright gate" as referring to the Blessed Virgin; see the Sequence for the Assumption, *Salve porta perpetuae lucis fulgida* (Daniel ii. 57), and such hymns as *Ave regina coelorum*, where we find *Salve porta Ex qua mundo lux est orta* (*ibid.*, ii. 319). James and his queen were at Durham on March 28 and at Melrose on April 5, and Bower says that he entered Scotland "circa dominicam in Passione" (April 9): see Fordun's *Scotichronicon*, ed. Hearne, iv. 1248. After keeping Easter in Edinburgh, they were crowned at Scone, May 21. It might then be said that the "mighty maiden" rose between Passion Sunday and May, the month of Mary.

5. *Cp. Cock* 7, "Then sall a lyon be lowsid."

9. *I.e.* in the sight of the people.

12. *Cp. Cock* 45, "All grace and godness sall growe us amonge."

14. Folk=individual is not recorded. The original was pretty certainly "tulke."

16. *Cp. Cock* 44, "We sall have plente of pese, quen law has na lett."

19. *Cp. Cock* 5, "Then sall þe mone ryse in þe north-west." But this seems to be in support of the lion, whereas in our poem it denotes an insurrection against him. "Worth" appears to be a scribal error for "worch."

20. blaw: blast of wind. It antedates the earliest example in *O.E.D.*, which is 1660.

23. stare: perhaps the original was "blase"; *cp. Piers Plowman*, C, xxi. 243: "ther blased a sterre."

24. os: the reading may be "es"; perhaps it is a corruption of "as lelly," leally.

28. *Cp. Cock* 15-16:

þe mole and þe mermaiden, moyde in mynde,  
Cryst that is our creatour has cursede them bi mouth,

which are in a stanza with two lines without any alliteration. The mole accused by God's mouth comes from the Prophecy of the Six Kings, and was identified by the Percy-Glendower party with Henry IV. But there he is not accompanied by any mermaid.

29. *Cp. Cock* 33: "þe fox and þe folmer in handis sall be tane."

31. *Cp. Cock* 34: "And to þe lion be ledde, law till abide."

32. Probably originally "questiones of quare & qualiter." The criminal was asked (as he still is) if he could show reason why

sentence of death should not be passed on him ; *cp.* the description in the St. Albans Chronicle, 1417, of the trial of Sir John Oldcastle : " Quesitum fuit ab eo qualiter se voluit excusare et ostendere quare non merito sit adiudicatus morti " (ed. V. H. Galbraith, p. 117). The reference would then be to the judicial proceedings at Inverness in 1428.

33. sette owte of sise : displaced from its established order.

36. From this point the allegory disappears.

37. ronke : probably originally " renke " : at a loss before that man.

40. *Cp. Prophecy of Waldhave* (Bannatyne Club, p. 34),

Then as a Lyon he looked me on.

MABEL DAY.

### JOHN DONNE AND EVERARD GILPIN

ONE of John Donne's shorter verse letters <sup>1</sup> is addressed to a Mr. E. G. who has never been satisfactorily identified. Sir Edmund Gosse <sup>2</sup> made an unsupported conjecture that he was Everard Gilpin, the author of a book of satires and epigrams, *Skialetheia*, published in 1598. But Professor Grierson <sup>3</sup> prefers to think that E. G. was "a Goodyere," although he advances no evidence except that Sir Henry Goodere begins one of his poems with the first line of Donne's letter to Mr. E.G. This is not good evidence, for Goodere was thoroughly familiar with Donne's unpublished poems, and he may have seen this verse letter even if it was not written to a member of his family. Moreover, if Donne was sufficiently well acquainted with some E. Goodere to have written this letter to him, it is strange that in all of Donne's letters to Sir Henry there is no trace of him, for we have such an extensive series of Donne's letters to Sir Henry Goodere that we might expect it to contain references to any of Sir Henry's family with whom Donne was intimate. Indeed, the only "E." Goodere born before 1611 was Edward Goodere of North Collingham in Nottinghamshire. He was a first cousin of Donne's friend, Sir Henry, but there is no evidence that he was a poet, that he ever resided in London or in Suffolk, or that he knew Donne.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, ed. H. J. C. Grierson (Oxford, 1912), I. 208-9.

<sup>2</sup> *The Life and Letters of John Donne* (London, 1899), I. 82.

<sup>3</sup> II. 169.

<sup>4</sup> There is an excellent genealogy of the Goodere family in Frederick Charles Cass's *Monken Hadley* (Westminster, 1880), between pp. 138-9.

Neither Gosse nor Professor Grierson made the most of the internal evidence. Since Donne's letter to Mr. E. G. is short, I quote it in full :

Even as lame things thirst their perfection, so  
 The slimy rimes bred in our vale below,  
 Bearing with them much of my love and hart,  
 Fly unto that Parnassus, where thou art.  
 There thou oreseest London : Here I have beene,  
 By staying in London, too much overseene.  
 Now pleasures dearth our City doth posses,  
 Our Theaters are fill'd with emptines ;  
 As lancke and thin is every street and way  
 As a woman deliver'd yesterday.  
 Nothing whereat to laugh my spleen espyes  
 But bearbaitings or Law exercise.  
 Therefore I'll leave it, and in the Country strive  
 Pleasure, now fled from London, to retrieve.  
 Do thou so too : and fill not like a Bee  
 Thy thighs with hony, but as plenteously  
 As Russian Marchants, thy selfes whole vessell load,  
 And then at Winter retails it here abroad.  
 Blesse us with Suffolks sweets ; and as it is  
 Thy garden, make thy hive and warehouse this.

It would be possible to interpret "There thou oreseest" as "There you look upon with contempt or disregard," were it not for the unmistakable meaning of "vale below" and "Parnassus" in the preceding lines, and for the fact that Donne certainly intended a contrast between "oreseest" in the fifth line and "overseene" in the sixth. Clearly, Mr. E. G. was a poet who was in a position to look down over London in a literal physical sense. Professor Grierson says, "Whoever is meant is in Suffolk." But one cannot oversee London from Suffolk, and although it would seem probable that Suffolk was included in Mr. E. G.'s vacation plans, his residence when Donne wrote to him was on a hill near London. The only likely place is the popular suburb of Highgate.

Mr. E. G. should, then, be a poet ("Parnassus" and "Blesse us with Suffolks sweets") who had left London temporarily for Highgate, and who was a native of, or who expected to visit, Suffolk. Although when Gosse wrote almost nothing was known about Everard Gilpin (as late as 1931 Mr. G. B. Harrison said, "He remains little more than a name"),<sup>1</sup> it is now possible to gather enough together to prove that all of these things were probably true of him.

Everard Gilpin's father was John Gilpin of Highgate. His

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare Association Facsimiles No. 2 : Everard Guilpin : Skiaetheia* (Oxford, 1931), p. vii.



mother was Thomasin Gilpin, daughter of John Everard of Gillingham in Norfolk. Her eldest brother's name was Edward, a fact which may explain why her son's Christian name sometimes appears as *Everard* and sometimes as *Edward*. The Everards were an old Norfolk and Suffolk family. Edward Everard owned property in Bungay, Suffolk, as well as in other parts of that county. His wife was a Suffolk woman.<sup>1</sup> After the death of John Gilpin in 1590/1, his widow married (before 1608) William Guercy, Esq., of Boyscott, Suffolk, and in 1608 her son, Everard Gilpin, was described as a resident of Boyscott.<sup>2</sup>

John Gilpin, likewise, had East Anglian connections. One of his brothers was Barnard Gilpin of Wymondham, Norfolk. (Another brother was Francis Gilpin, Esq., of Westminster. He also had a "cousin," Josua Gilpin, parson of St. Vedast in Foster Lane, London.)<sup>3</sup> But we are chiefly interested in the fact that he lived in Highgate. He was elected a governor of the Highgate Grammar School in 1580 "in place of William Lambe, a Foundation Governor," and what was apparently his property in Swain's Lane passed upon his death in 1590/1 to his son Everard and his widow Thomasin.<sup>4</sup> He paid taxes as a resident of Kentishtown (*i.e.* Highgate) in the twenty-seventh, thirtieth, and thirty-first years of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>5</sup>

Besides being a governor of the Highgate Grammar School he was clerk of the pleas in the Court of the Exchequer.<sup>6</sup> In his will, made March 1, 1586/7, and proved May 10, 1591,<sup>7</sup> he named Mr. Anthonie Myldemay, Esq., his friend, and his brothers, Edward Everard and Francis Gilpin, as supervisors. Although he intimated that his property was not extensive, he was obviously a person of some consequence. He was buried at St. Andrews, Holborn, on March 11, 1590/1.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MS. Harley 6093, fol. 150<sup>v</sup> (old folio 193<sup>r</sup>), and folio 13<sup>v</sup> (old 18<sup>r</sup>); MS. Harley, 1177, folio 175<sup>r</sup> (old 80<sup>r</sup>); the will of John Gilpin, P.C.C. 36 Sainberbe; *The Visitation of Norfolk . . . by William Hervey . . . 1563*, ed. Walter Rye, Harleian Society, xxxii (London, 1891), p. 117; Inq. Post Mortem for Edward Everard, 43 Elizabeth, Chancery Series II, vol. 266, No. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *London County Council Survey of London*, ed. Sir George Gater and Walter H. Godfrey, vol. xvii, *The Village of Highgate* (London, 1936), pp. 39, 42.

<sup>3</sup> Wills of John Gilpin (see note <sup>1</sup>, above); Barnard Gylpin, P.C.C. 23 Drury; Catherine Guilpine, P.C.C. 83 Bolein; and Josua Gylpin, P.C.C. 90 Harte.

<sup>4</sup> See note <sup>2</sup>, above.

<sup>5</sup> P.R.O., E115/167, No. 47; E115/169, No. 8; E179/269, No. 41.

<sup>6</sup> *London County Council . . . Highgate*, p. 42.

<sup>7</sup> See note <sup>1</sup>, above.

<sup>8</sup> His burial is recorded as No. 165 for 1590 in the unpublished parish record. have searched these records in vain for other entries about him or his family.

John Gilpin's son, Everard, matriculated at Cambridge in 1588, and was entered as a pensioner of Emmanuel College, June 1 of that year.<sup>1</sup> There is no evidence that he proceeded to a degree. On April 29, 1591, he was admitted to Gray's Inn.<sup>2</sup> Whether or not he was called to the bar is unknown. In 1608, as we have seen, he was described as of Boyscott, Suffolk.

By 1598 Gilpin had written verse satires and epigrams, and his interest in this kind of writing may easily have begun in the early 1590's, when both he and Donne were students in the Inns of Court and when Donne was probably writing his first satires. Gilpin may have retired at any time before 1609 to his house in Highgate to spend the summer, and there were certainly relatives living in Suffolk,<sup>3</sup> including at some time after 1591 his mother and his step-father at Boyscott. Everard Gilpin is, then, not merely, as Gosse said, "the only known denizen of Parnassus in the Elizabethan age whose initials were E. G."<sup>4</sup> but he is also the one man to whom what we know of the E. G. of Donne's letter applies. For the present, therefore, we must accept the identification of Donne's Mr. E. G. as Everard Gilpin.

Donne's letter to Gilpin must have been written after 1591 when Gilpin entered Gray's Inn, since Gilpin would not have been a figure in the literary society of London before that date; and it must have been written before 1608/9, when the family property in Highgate was sold. The general tone of the letter suggests a date before Donne's marriage in 1601. Sir Edmund Gosse said that "the reference to closed theatres and abandoned streets suggests the plague months from the autumn of 1592 to the close of 1593,"

<sup>1</sup> John and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1922-27), II, 218.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Foster, *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889* (London, 1889), p. 78, gives his name as Edward, but MS. Harley, 1912, fol. 34<sup>r</sup>, has it Everard.

<sup>3</sup> I have not been able to connect the Gilpins of Highgate, Westminster, and Wymondham with the Gilpins of Bungay, Suffolk, but such a connection may easily have existed. Our genealogical information about the Highgate family is very meagre. For the Gilpins of Bungay see *A Visitation of the County of Suffolk . . . 1664-1668*, by Sir Edward Bysshe, Kt., ed. W. H. Rylands, Harleian Society, LKI (1910), p. 81.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Virgil Heltzel has called my attention to several other E. G.'s, but none is a likely candidate. The E. G. who contributed verses to Timothe Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes* (1577) cannot have been either Gilpin, as W. C. Hazlitt suggested (*Handbook*, p. 247), or Donne's Mr. E. G., because both of them were presumably young men in the 1590's. An E. G. contributed a commendatory poem to Sylvester's *Du Bartas*. Grosart, in the index to his edition of *Du Bartas*, identified him with Edward Gayton. If Grosart meant Edmund Gayton he was certainly wrong. There are also verses by E. G. in Dekker's *Lanthorne* (1609). These last two E. G.'s, for all we know, may have been Gilpin.

and since the letter was written in the summer, the summer of 1593 is as good a conjecture as any.

At all events the letter was probably written before Donne went on his two expeditions with the Earl of Essex, for there is evidence that his friendship with Gilpin suffered from neglect at about this time. Much of Gilpin's *Satyra tertia* is devoted to a complaint about his friends who, having distinguished themselves in various ways, have become cold towards him. He especially charges them with having abandoned "deep philosophy" for vain toys, and he mentions "*Cades*-beards" with some rancour. This is hardly a conventional theme of satire. It is true that Hall (*Virgidemiarum*, Bk. III, Satire VII)<sup>1</sup> devotes a few lines to the hungry gallant who has a beard of the new style and who has been at Cadiz. But Hall's satire is general, whereas Gilpin betrays strong personal chagrin. It is possible that several of Gilpin's old friends had deserted him or that there was only one. The probability is that, not having gone on the voyages himself, he found that, when new circles of friends formed in 1597-8, he was an outsider. Yet there is no mistaking that at least one definite person was in Gilpin's mind and that he was, like John Donne, the son of an ironmonger. I quote Gilpin:

With them in ranck *La volto Publius*,<sup>2</sup>  
 VVho's growne a reueller ridiculous :  
 And for his dad with *Chimicke* vsurie,  
 Turnd yron to sterling, drosse to land and fee,  
 And got so by old horse-shooes, that the foole  
 Enterd himselfe into the dauncing schoole ;  
 Thinks scorne to speake : especially now since  
 H'ath beene a player to a Christmas prince.  
 When these, & such like doe themselues estrange,  
 I neuer muse at theyr fantasticke change :  
 Because they are Phantasmas butterflies,  
 Inconstant, but yet witlesse *Mercuries*.  
 I know some of their humorous neere of kin,  
 Which scorne to speake to one which hath not bin  
 In one of these last voyages : or to one  
 Which hauing bin there yet (though he haue none)  
 Hath not a *Cades*-beard : though I dare sweare  
 That many a beardlesse chin hath marched where  
 They durst not for their berds come, thogh they dare  
 Come where they will not leaue theyr beardes one haire  
 But I doe wonder what estrangeth thee,  
 New cast in mold of deepe philosophy :  
 Thee whom that Queene hath taught to moderate,  
 Thy mounting thought, nor to be eleuate  
 With puffingat fortunes ? though (for ought I know)  
 Thy fortunes are none such to puffe thee so.  
 (Sigg. C8<sup>r</sup>-Dr<sup>r</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> See Hall's *Works*, ed. Philip Wynter (Oxford, 1863), ix. 616-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Publius* is the name given by Marston to the idolatrous lover in *The Scourge of Villainy*, Satire VIII, ll. 84 ff.

The son of a rich ironmonger, who had been on the recent voyages, one of which was to Cadiz, was almost certainly John Donne. If he was, that Donne participated in a Christmas masque is new information. It was presumably the Christmas "shew" of 1597/98 at Lincoln's Inn, about which almost nothing is known.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to this rather plaintive attack upon the ironmonger's son, Gilpin satirizes the amorous poet in his "Satyre Preludium":

Heere one's Elegiack pen patheticall,  
His parting from his Mistris doth bewaile :  
Which when young gallant *Mutio* hath perus'd,  
His valour's crestfalne, his resolues abusd,  
For vvhatsoe're his courage erst did moue,  
He'le goe no voyage nevv to leaue his Loue.  
(Sig. B8)

All of this might easily apply to Donne's *Elegies* V and XVI, and especially to *Elegie* XX, *Loves Warre*, where Donne wrote :

Till I have peace with thee, warr other men,  
And when I have peace, can I leave thee then ?

There men kill men, we'll make one by and by,  
Thou nothing ; I not halfe so much shall do  
In these Warrs, as they may which from us two  
Shall spring. Thousands wee see which travaile not  
To warrs ; But stay swords, armes, and shott  
To make at home ; And shall not I do then  
More glorious service, staying to make men ?

In Hall's *Virgidemiarum* (Bk. IV, Satire IV, ll. 84 ff.) there is what appears to be an answer to Donne's sophistry :

Wars, God forfend ! nay, God defend from war !  
Soon are sons spent, that not soon reared are.

Hie, wanton Gallio, and wed betime,  
Why shouldst thou leese the pleasures of thy prime ?

Hie thee, and give the world yet one dwarf more,  
Such as it got when thou thyself wast bore.

The least that can be said is that there is certainly some connection among these three passages, although just what the relationship is, it is impossible to determine.

We must not, however, infer too quickly that Donne and Gilpin had quarrelled. These jibes may not have appeared so serious then as they do now. At all events, Gilpin paid Donne the compliment of imitation. He begins his fifth satire as follows :

<sup>1</sup> See E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), I. 223, note 1.

Let me alone I prethee in thys Cell,  
 Entice me not into the Citties hell ;  
 Tempt me not forth this *Eden* of content,  
 To tast of that vvhich I shall soone repent :  
 Prethy excuse me, I am not alone  
 Accompanied with meditation,  
 And calme content, vvhose tast more pleaseth me  
 Then all the Citties lushious vanity.  
 I had rather be encoffin'd in this chest  
 Amongst these bookes and papers I protest,  
 Then free-booting abroad purchase offence,  
 And scandale my calme thoughts with discontents.

And he continues for twenty-four more lines to elaborate upon and expand the first twelve lines of Donne's first satire. I quote a few lines from Donne to indicate the nature of Gilpin's paraphrase :

Away thou fondling motley humorist,  
 Leave mee, and in this standing wooden chest,  
 Comforted with these few bookes, let me lye  
 In prison, and here be coffin'd, when I dye.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence for Gilpin's acquaintance with Donne is very strong. That he knew at least one of Donne's unpublished satires is certain ; that both he and Hall knew some of the elegies is very probable ; that Donne's Mr. E. G. was Gilpin is by far the best conjecture which has been made ; and that Gilpin was hurt by Donne's superior bearing upon his return from the voyage to Cadiz is altogether likely.

It is well known that Gilpin participated with Marston and Hall in a small satirical war. That Donne should appear only on the periphery of this affair is not surprising. He did not publish his satires ; he answered no attacks against himself. We imagine him in the late 1590's to have been respected and perhaps a little feared by other young poets. He, far more than most of them, remained dignified and aloof, sure of himself, always friendly, but perhaps a little condescending towards those who published and who embroiled themselves in literary quarrels.

R. E. BENNETT.

<sup>1</sup> This instance of Gilpin's indebtedness to Donne has been noticed by Raymond Macdonald Alden : *The Rise of Formal Satire in England, Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology*, VII, No. 2 (Philadelphia, 1899), p. 153 ; cf. Grierson, II. 105-6 ; Harrison, p. ix.

## TWO NOTES ON MILTON

I. DID MILTON CHANGE HIS VIEWS AFTER *PARADISE LOST* ?

PROFESSOR SAURAT<sup>1</sup> endeavours to show that Milton's views on the Trinity and on the death of Christ are the same in *Paradise Lost* as in *De Doctrina Christiana*. The point is of great importance, for I think that if Milton did change his views after *Paradise Lost* was written, and if that change is reflected in *De Doctrina Christiana*, much of Mr. Saurat's interpretation of the poem remains very doubtful.<sup>2</sup> The points at issue are :

(1) Does Milton express any doubt in *Paradise Lost* as to Christ's death in *both* His natures, the divine and the human ?

(2) Are there any passages in *Paradise Lost* which seem to show that Milton had not yet reached the Unitarian view expounded in the treatise ?

(1) In my first article<sup>3</sup> I quoted the Son's speech (III. 245 ff.) :

Though now to Death I yield, and am his due  
All of me that can die, yet that debt paid  
Thou wilt not leave me in the loathsome grave  
His prey, nor suffer my unspotted Soule  
For ever with corruption there to dwell.

Professor Saurat compares this with Adam's speech (X. 780) in which Adam first expresses doubt as to whether his soul will die with his body, but ends the soliloquy with these words : " All of me then shall die." Professor Saurat suggests that the Son's speech and Adam's speech express " the same sentiments." It is impossible to agree with him. There is surely a difference between the doubtful " All of me that can die " and the positive " All of me then shall die." Professor Saurat further states that while Adam's " soul," which is sinful, dies with the body, the Son's soul, which is " unspotted," shall not die. The lines quoted above do not allow of that interpretation. Milton clearly implies that part of the payment of the " debt " is the death of the Son's " unspotted Soule." The Son recognizes that His " soul " will " dwell with corruption " for a space of time, but he knows that the Father will not suffer it to dwell there " for ever."

This interpretation receives striking confirmation in *De Doctrina Christiana*. In Milton's discussion of the death of Christ—a

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.*, 1936, XII, No. 47, p. 324.

<sup>2</sup> Saurat : *Milton, Man and Thinker*, 1924.

<sup>3</sup> *Essays and Studies*, 1933, XIX.

passage much amended and supplemented by later additions—the original Version contains these words :

siquidem Christus vere mortuus :  
tum enim anima, ut  
demonstratum est supra, cum  
corpore eundem diem obiit.<sup>1</sup>

Christ's "soul," therefore, dies with His body.

In the same passage from the treatise, *before it was amended*, Milton expresses doubts as to whether Christ died in His *divine* as well as His *human* nature.

De natura autem divina,  
eane quoque morti succubuerit,  
hæsitatio major est.

This, surely, is the true significance of the phrase in the poem,

All of me that can die.

When he wrote the poem and when he first wrote the treatise, Milton was in some doubt as to whether the Son was "slain" in the whole of his nature. After the poem was written and when he came to "reform" his doctrine "after a more accurate model"<sup>2</sup> he added in the margin of the treatise an unequivocal statement, which ends with these words :

totus igitur Christus, agnus ille,  
mactatus fuit.<sup>3</sup>

It seems to me, therefore, that a study of the handwriting of the MSS., which Professor Saurat says "proves nothing," helps us to an understanding of the development of Milton's view.

(2) Professor Saurat agrees that Milton does not decide in Book III, ll. 1 ff., whether the Son was co-eternal with or later than the Father. Perhaps the central argument in Milton's discussion of the Son in *De Doctrina Christiana* and in Mr. Saurat's interpretation of the poem is this :

in tempore genuit Deus Filium . . .<sup>4</sup>

Professor Saurat must therefore agree that in one respect at least Milton's view was more assured when he wrote the treatise than

<sup>1</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton : *Works*, Columbia edn., vol. xv, p. 306.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. xiv, p. 9.

*Ibid.*, vol. xv.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. xiv.



when he wrote the poem. In *Paradise Lost* Milton, according to Professor Saurat, "considers" the problem "too high for him to solve." I agree. In *De Doctrina Christiana* it is central in his view. This would surely argue, if not a change, at least a crystallization of opinion.

It is clear that in the poem Milton throughout suggests that the Son is in some way inferior to the Father. But this view is not altogether unorthodox, for the subordination of the Son is recognized in all scholastic theology.<sup>1</sup> The novelty in Milton's view is not the inferiority of the Son but the generation of the Son in time. There is no clear mention of this in *Paradise Lost*.

I cannot agree with Professor Saurat that the Third Person does not come into the Invocation at the beginning of Book III. The "pure Etherial stream" cannot be merely another name for "holy Light." The very construction of the passage makes that interpretation impossible. "Or hear'st thou rather" is surely a form of words which implies that Milton turns from one Person to another. Moreover, the Person who

at the voice  
Of God, as with a mantle, didst invest  
The rising world of waters dark and deep (III. 9).

must be one with the Person who

on the watery calm  
His brooding wings (the Spirit of God) outspread (VII. 234).

And this was the Third Person.

Professor Saurat suggests that I have gone astray because I have not borne in mind Milton's "general ideas" "as expressed in many passages." "A single expression, like 'equal to God,' may be misleading," he says, "unless brought into relation with a broader principle." That is obvious, of course. But we cannot be sure that the "broader principle" is Milton's and not of our own devising unless we bring it into relation with many such "particular passages."

## II. THE INTERPRETATION OF *PARADISE LOST*, BOOK VII, LL. 168 ff.

Professor Saurat's interpretation of the thought of Milton

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Quincunque vult : "minor Patre secundum humanitatem."

depends very much on his interpretation of the following passage from *Paradise Lost* :

Boundless the Deep, because I am who fill  
 Infinitude ; nor vacuous the space,  
 Though I, uncircumscribed, myself retire,  
 And put not forth my goodness, which is free  
 To act or not. Necessity and chance  
 Approach not me, and what I will is Fate (vii. 168).

Professor Saurat interprets this passage in the light of Cabbalist thought on the lines of Milton's arguments in *De Doctrina Christiana*. I hope to show that it will bear a different interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

When Milton composed this passage, his mind was occupied with a picture of universal space, the Heavens above and Chaos beneath, reaching down to Hell. This Chaos was the "Deep," into which God had bidden his Word and Spirit to "ride forth" and in which they were to appoint the bounds of Heaven and Earth. In this Chaos, Deity must somehow or other be present, for God is omnipresent. How should God be present in this rude, unformed mass, where all was confused and disorderly? Professor Saurat may well be right in supposing that Milton had read the *Zohar* and had used it for his own purposes. God was there potentially, but He had withdrawn Himself so that it was, as yet, "unadorned and undigested."

But Milton must also have recalled that other picture of Chaos in Book II: "unessential night" where "utter loss of Being" threatens Satan as he makes his fearful way through. Because God's goodness is not exercised there, it is dire negation, utter Darkness; "Chance governs all." But when Nature "first begins her farthest verge," Chaos must retire:

As from her outmost works, a broken foe,  
 With tumult less and with less hostile din (II. 1040).

We find exactly the same ideas in the passage under review. Necessity and Chance, which have government in Chaos, may not approach God, for what He wills is Fate. We should suppose, indeed, that Necessity and Chance have place only where God "puts not forth his goodness": and that where God's goodness is exercised, there is Fate, there is the sphere of God's will. Beauty and order are the witnesses of His efficiency.

<sup>1</sup> Saurat: *Milton, Man and Thinker*. 1924.

In *De Doctrina Christiana* there is a passage in exact agreement with this interpretation :

Certe quae in mundo sunt omnia, pulcherrimo ordine, fini alicui bonoque facta, testantur praeexistisse summum aliquem efficientem qui finem sibi in his omnibus proposuerit.

Nonnulli naturam aut fatum supremum quoddam in rebus esse argutantur : sed natura natam se fatetur aut proprie rem nullam significat, sed vel rei essentiam, vel communem illam legem, qua nascuntur omnia atque agunt ; et fatum quid nisi effatum divinum omnipotentis cuiuspiam numinis potest esse ?

Quinetiam Natura fieri omnia qui volunt, necesse est fortunam quoque adiungant ei divinitatis participem ; atque ita quid aliud assequuntur nisi ut pro imo Deo, quem non ferunt, duas vel inviti Deos perpetuo fere sibi adversantes, rerum dominas inducant.<sup>1</sup>

Milton here specifically mentions the joint rulers of Chaos, "Necessity and Chance," and he declares that what God wills is Fate.

Professor Saurat derives Milton's phrase "put not forth my goodness" from a sentence in the *Zohar* in which God is said to have "contracted the holy light" : and he supports his view by pointing out that in the *Zohar* "goodness" and "light" are two names for the Shekhina, parallel to the Son. I can see no warrant for supposing that Milton here indulged in deliberate obscurity. A more simple gloss on the phrase "put not forth my goodness" is available and, I think, preferable.

A passage from a contemporary writer, with whom Milton seems to have had something in common, may help us. Cudworth epitomizes what I take to have been Milton's view in a sermon preached before the House of Commons in 1647 :

God's Power displayed in the world, is nothing but *his goodness strongly reaching all things* from height to depth : and irresistibly imparting itself to everything according to those severall degrees in which it is capable of it.

In *Paradise Regained*, Milton expresses the same idea :

... Since his Word all things produced,  
Though chiefly not for glory as prime end,  
But to show forth his goodness, and impart  
His good communicable to every soul  
Freely (III. 122).

There is a further parallel to this in Cudworth's writings which may help us to interpret Milton's thought. In answer to the question, Why did God create the world ? Cudworth writes :

<sup>1</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton : *Works*, Columbia edn., vol. xiv, p. 26.

That the reason why God made the world was from his overflowing and communicative goodness, . . . (God made the world) to communicate his goodness, which is chiefly and properly his glory.

To "put forth His goodness," "to impart His good freely" is surely the very purpose of creation. And Professor Saurat is surely in error when he supposes that God's only share in the work of creation was an act of withdrawal, a "contraction of the holy light," a bare decision to "put not forth my goodness."

In the mind of Milton the thought is clear: that when God exerts His goodness, Necessity and Chance and the dark hostility of the Deep must all retire and yield to his beneficence. This is the view put forward in *Paradise Lost* and in *De Doctrina Christiana*. Professor Saurat with great brilliance has argued a "broader principle" from the doubtful interpretation of a "single passage."

W. A. SEWELL.

[The above has been shown to Professor Saurat, who writes as follows:]

#### I. DID MILTON CHANGE HIS VIEWS AFTER *PARADISE LOST*?

*Paradise Lost* was published in 1667; and the 1674 edition was rearranged into twelve books instead of ten. Milton had therefore plenty of time and opportunity to alter *Paradise Lost* had he wished to, even to the date of his death.

Why did he not do so? Is it conceivable that on essential points, such as the Doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of the soul and of death, Milton would have allowed what he had come to consider as great errors to go out under his name in *Paradise Lost*, when the *Treatise of Christian Doctrine* was not published? What he gave to the public in 1674, at his death, must be considered his final opinion. It seems to me that Milton's character, his opinion of the high importance of his mission and responsibilities as a poet and a religious thinker, puts it out of court that it should be otherwise. As I understand the man Milton, no trouble would have been too great for him, either before 1667 or between 1667 and his death, and he would have altered all the passages in *Paradise Lost* that no longer expressed his thought.

As we do not know precisely when the treatise was closed, if a change could be proved we should have to assume that the change took place *after* the treatise was put aside, and is embodied in the poem. Which is absurd.

The relationship between the two works is not chronological, but psychological or artistic. One is not the expression of Milton's thought *after* the other was written. The poem is the expression of that part of Milton's thought which he thought susceptible of an artistic presentation that would appeal to all Christians, and even to all wise men even outside Christianity; Milton therefore in the poem avoids what he considers controversial points, even if his own mind is settled; thus he nowhere mentions in the poem his belief that there is no such thing as the soul;—once we have read the treatise and re-read the poem, we see the belief is present in the poem; but it is not explicit. In the treatise, on the contrary, Milton wishes to reach the most precise expression of his opinions, and discusses fully all the views that are opposed to his—which would be out of place in the poem.

One or two points can be quickly settled. Mr. Sewell says: "there is no clear mention of (the generation of the Son in time) in *Paradise Lost*."

I read in Book V, l. 603:

This day I have begot whom I declare  
My only Son.

In Book VI, l. 451, one of the angels addressed Satan as

Deliverer from new lords,

the reason of the revolt being that the Son was a recent creation. The Person who

on the watery calm  
His brooding wings outspread (VII. 234.)

is referred to by the treatise (vol. xiv (Columbia), pp. 359, 361). Commenting on "the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters," Milton says "it appears to be used with reference to the Son." Therefore it is not the Third Person, as Mr. Sewell says.

I would not refer to Milton's views as "Unitarian." Do the Unitarians believe that the Son is the Creative God, though inferior to the Father, and that there is no such thing as the soul? I confess I do not know.

Mr. Sewell seems to think that "Milton did change his views after *Paradise Lost* was written"—and "that change is reflected in the *De Doctrina*." Yet a few lines below this statement he says "This interpretation" (of *Paradise Lost*, III. 245) "receives striking confirmation in the *De Doctrina*." Where then is the

change reflected? Did Milton also change while writing the *De Doctrina*? Where then shall we find his doctrine?

"Hæsitatio major est" does not contradict the two lines that come earlier on the same page. It is the beginning of a new argument, concluded on p. 308 with "totus igitur, etc." There is no contradiction at all in the whole of the two pages, but the development of an argument. Milton states that many have hesitated, but that he has found the solution: *the whole of Christ died*.

Vol. xiv. p. 9, does not apply to Milton, but is applied by Milton to his predecessors.

## II. PARADISE LOST, VII, 168 ff.

Mr. Sewell's criticism is based on wrong punctuation. There is a full stop after

*nor vacuous the space*

There is only a comma after

*to act or not*

Beeching, p. 322, and Columbia, p. 217, agree on this. The words "Necessity and chance approach me not" are connected with "Though I uncircumscribed myself retire." Cudworth's "his goodness strongly reaching all things" does not explain "and put not forth my goodness," since this Miltonic fragment means exactly the opposite of Cudworth's expressions. The essential word is *not*.

God's only share in the work of creation is an act of withdrawal, according to Milton. The active part of creation is the Son's share. God withdraws, then the Son creates. Theology is complicated, but Milton is a great logician and does *not* contradict himself.

DENIS SAURAT.

## A NOTE ON DR. JOHNSON'S LETTER No. 34 TO THE REV. DR. TAYLOR

In his list of letters from Dr. Samuel Johnson to the Reverend Dr. John Taylor, printed by Dr. R. W. Chapman in this *Review* in the issue of January 1926, there appeared on page 90 a lacuna in Taylor's numbering between 30 and 35. As but three letters, subsequent to 30, but unnumbered by Taylor, appeared in this list, it was evident that one was seemingly lost. Over a decade later, on the

appearance of Dr. Chapman's trial list of all Johnson letters, in the April 1937 issue, this letter was still missing.

This letter, lying dormant for all this time in the collection of the late George Allison Armour of Princeton, New Jersey, was finally sold at the American Art Association Anderson Galleries sale of November 12, 1937, and came into the possession of the writer.

Written at Southwark on Thursday, March 23, 1775, the same day that Johnson wrote to Edmund Hector (see Reade, *Johnsonian Gleanings*, VIII, 1), and bearing on the address side both the number 34 in Taylor's hand and the franking signature in Thrale's hand: "H free Thrale", this letter is notable for its allusions to the contemporary publication of Johnson's contribution to the American colonial discussion of the period, *Taxation no Tyranny*. The text follows:

"Dear Sir

I am told that your month of residence is April, and that you are making so<sup>1</sup> attempt to defer it, till a further time in Summer. I cannot judge of your convenience, but considering my own, I wish you to be here in April, because, I think, I can very commodiously accompany you to Derbyshire in May, and the following months will not suit me so well.

I am again gotten into politicks, and have written a pamphlet in answer to the American Congress. I shall send it you.

I am,

Sir,

Yours etc.

Sam: Johnson

March 23, 1775

It is interesting to note from Boswell (II, 381, note 2) that Johnson carried out his plan and was away from London from May to August, his letters to Mrs. Thrale being written at Ashbourne from July 1 to 21 (*R. E. S.*, XIII, 157), so that it seems evident that Dr. Taylor acceded to his request.

AMOS ASCHBACH ETTINGER.

### JOHNSON'S LETTERS TO TAYLOR

THE REV. DR. JOHN TAYLOR was a careful man, and though his talk was of bullocks, he could appreciate his friend's greatness. One of Johnson's letters to him he endorsed "the best letter in the world."

<sup>1</sup> Johnson meant to write *some*?



He did not keep all his letters ; for he confessed to Boswell that he could not find the letter which Johnson wrote him in the small hours of the morning on which Mrs. Johnson died. But it is probable that he kept most of them ; and what he had, he numbered in chronological order.

Taylor printed three of them in 1787, in his own *Letter to Samuel Johnson, LL.D. on the Subject of a Future State*. These are 42, 848, 951 in Birkbeck Hill's numeration, and were reprinted by Boswell. Neither Boswell nor any of his early editors had access to any other letters, though Malone had seen two of them.

There is a life of Taylor by the late Rev. Thomas Taylor, F.S.A. (n.d., but c. 1910). But I do not find in this interesting book any account of the descent of Taylor's papers. My knowledge of the later history of the manuscripts begins with a note made by M. M. Holloway, a dealer in autographs, in a volume containing a large number of the letters :

These MSS. were purchased by Sir John Simeon . . . in 1861 from a descendant of the Pierpoint family in Devonshire . . . about 12 have been printed for the Philobiblon Society by Sir J. S., from whom I bought the collection, and sold this portion [i.e. those in the volume] to the Lord Overstone.

The Overstone collection, now the property of Mr. Loyd of Lockinge, consists of (1) three letters printed by Taylor ; (2) nine letters printed, with these three, for the Philobiblon Society ; (3) nineteen other letters, later printed in *Notes and Queries* : in all 31. Sir John Simeon's own account of his collection is in *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society for 1860-1* :

The letters, of which those now printed form a small portion, extend in an almost unbroken series through the years from 1742 to 1790 [Johnson died 1784, Taylor 1788]. They were the property of the Lady Frances Stephens, after whose demise they descended to her daughter, from whose hands they came into my possession.

" An almost unbroken series through the years " seems a loose expression, for there are no letters between 1742 and 1752, nor between 1756 and 1763. Happily Taylor's own numbering precludes any probability that Simeon had many letters now lost. Perhaps " unbroken " refers to the numbers ; but if Sir John meant that, he wrote obscurely.

It is probable that the Simeon collection was nearly complete. If Simeon described it accurately, it was not quite complete, for it did not contain the letter of July 27, 1732. It certainly contained, in addition to the Overstone letters, those numbered by Hill 158, 175, 231, 275; for these are not in the Overstone-Loyd collection and are in the Philobiblon selection.

Twenty-seven letters, the property of a country Gentleman—evidently a collector on a large scale—were sold at Sotheby's on March 31 (and two days following), 1875. This collection included no letter which was in the Overstone collection; but it did include 175, which is in Philobiblon and therefore was in the Simeon collection. Many of the letters which are not in the Overstone collection were in the hands of collectors or dealers when Hill edited Johnson's letters in 1892; these may well have come from Holloway. There seems to be no indication of any private and hereditary source, other than Lady Frances Stephens.

In the *Review of English Studies*, II. 5 (Jan. 1926), p. 89, I printed a list of the known letters to Taylor. The numbers of the missing letters and their approximate dates can be determined; for Taylor numbered the letters in order of date, and recorded that 102 (Oct. 23, 1784, 1028 in Birkbeck Hill) was the last of the series. In my former article, following Hill, I numbered this letter 108; I have since seen it, and it is clearly 102, which reduces the number of missing letters.

In the course of twelve years some of my gaps have closed. The discovery of Taylor's number 22, Oct. 13, 1772, at Harvard, of 25, March 20, 1773, in an old catalogue, and of 28, Jan. 15, 1774 (the property of Mr. H. Ll. Davies), with the recent acquisition by Mr. Amos Ettinger of 34, March 23, 1775 [see pp. 80-81 of this issue], completes the series from 1 to 38 with one exception: 29, between Jan. 15 and Oct. 20, 1774, is missing.

39 and 40, late 1775 or early 1776, are missing; so are 49 and 50, between June 1776 and Jan. 1777 (Jan. 23, 1777, being now known to be 51).

Between 53, May 19, 1777, and 59, Aug. 3, 1779, there are perhaps now three not four blanks, two of the five interveners having been found—the letter misdated April 20, 1778 (Hill 660), and a letter of May 4, 1779 (Harvard); the latter, however, has no number, and there may be still four missing.

61 and 62 are now fixed, 61 (Hill 676) belongs to Dr. Ernest

Sadler, 62, May 12, 1781, was in Mr. Gabriel Wells's hands ten years ago.

Between 73 and 77 only one letter is now missing, 74. 75 is Dec. 7, 1782 (Dr. Rosenbach), therefore Dec. 9, 1782, Hill 816, must be 76.

87, Nov. 1783, is still missing.

Between 88 and 95 there are still blanks. But we now know that Jan. 24, 1784 (Hill 928, Huntington Library) is 93.

"After 95 there is no clue," I wrote in 1926. But we now have 96, June 8, 1784 (Gabriel Wells 1927), and know that June 23 (Hill 968, Huntington) is 98; therefore June 19 (Hill 967) is 97. After 98 we have one letter, Oct. 20 (Sotheby 1875) and two blanks before 102.

It looks as if some fifteen letters are still to seek.

Even the letters which are thus known are not all known to the satisfaction of an editor. The following texts are still not available:

Jan. 2,	1742	(sold in 1875)
Dec. 14,	1772	(known only from a MS. note by Hill)
March 20,	1773	(known from one of Holloway's catalogues)
Feb. 9,	1775	(sold in 1875)
April 29,	1776	(sold in 1875)
March 22,	1782	(recorded in Johnson's <i>Prayers &amp; Meditations</i> )
June 13,	1782	(sold in 1875)
Nov. 10,	1783	(sold at Sotheby's Dec. 4, 1916; but perhaps identical with Nov. 19, 1783, being misdated in the catalogue)

The following texts are doubtful, and verification is to be desired:

July 2, 1770, and April 17, 1772. The text is that of the Philo-biblon Society, which is not always accurate.

August 15, 1772, printed in the *Reliquary* 1873.

Sept. 21, 1782, printed by Hill, from a copy.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

## GIBBON'S DEBT TO CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARSHIP

GIBBON's own references form a very revealing representation of the state and condition not only of his own scholarship, but also of the literary cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century.

Gibbon's own boast (Chap. LVI, note <sup>1</sup>) was that he had ascended to the fountain-head as often as such ascent could be either profitable or possible and that he had diligently turned over the originals. A study of the text and notes abundantly supports this statement, yet there are nearly 3,000 references to secondary sources or authorities, and if we include compilations such as Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, the number of such references to contemporary scholars exceeds 4,000.

Before proceeding to any further analysis of the figures, there are some qualifications to be observed. The compiler of these figures has included those works of seventeenth-century scholarship which were in current use at Gibbon's day and which had not then been superseded. Gibbon's penchant for French is well known, and his residence in Switzerland, which was one of the intellectual focal-points of that European culture which found its expression in and through French, doubtless tended to increase this preference, which may have originated in intellectual snobbery, though we must remember the international importance of French as the language of polite scholarship. Moreover, despite the fact that Gibbon continued his education in circumstances favourable to the study of German and that two at least of his friends—Holcroft and Deyverdun—knew that language, he never learnt it, and had to rely upon French translations of the work of Niebuhr and Schmidt and had to call upon the kind services of a friend, possibly Deyverdun, to help with the reading of Reiske's translation of Marei.

The statistics of references or allusions, taken from the 1844 edition are as follow: <sup>1</sup>

## AUTHORS

(irrespective of the number of times Gibbon uses them)

	ROUGHLY CONTEMPORARY	EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	IN CHAPS. XV & XVI
French .. .. .	191 (46.7%)	157 (46.9%)	26 (44.8%)
English .. .. .	115 (28.1%)	98 (29.5%)	20 (34.5%)
German .. .. .	70 (17.1%)	55 (13.4%)	8 (13.8%)
Italian .. .. .	25 (6.1%)	21 (6.3%)	2 (3.5%)
Others .. .. .	8 (1.9%)	6 (1.8%)	2 (3.5%)
Total .. .. .	409	337	58

<sup>1</sup> The first column of figures is arranged according to the nationality of the scholar, e.g. Muratori is counted as Italian.

## NUMBER OF REFERENCES

French .. .. .	2,472 (56%)	2,050 (54.3%)	66 (38.6%)
English .. .. .	681 (5.4%)	550 (14.6%)	50 (29.2%)
German .. .. .	713 (16.2%)	651 (17.2%)	48 (28.1%)
Italian .. .. .	486 (11%)	472 (12.5%)	6 (3.5%)
Others .. .. .	61 (1.4%)	54 (1.4%)	2 (1.1%)
Totals .. .. .	4,413	3,777	172

## SECONDARY SOURCES

(according to the language of publication, omitting compilations)

French .. .. .	1,610 references	(58.5%)
Latin .. .. .	659 "	(22.6%)
English .. .. .	390 "	(13.9%)
Italian .. .. .	135 "	(4.8%)
Spanish .. .. .	15 "	(0.5%)
Total	2,809	

These figures seem to me to be a true representation of the intellectual state of Europe. France was the centre of culture and of such general study of history as was being carried on at the time, as is illustrated by mentioning such writers as Tillemont, Montesquieu, and Voltaire in general and philosophical history, and D'Anville, Beausobre, the contributors to the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions* and the Benedictines in specialized fields of research. It is not surprising, therefore, that those modern authors to whom Gibbon makes most frequent reference are predominately French. He refers to seventeen authors on more than forty occasions each, and of these at least eleven are French, namely, Tillemont (251 refs.), Ducange (151), D'Anville (128), D'Herbelot (125), *Mémoires of the Academy of Inscriptions* (120), De Guignes (72), Montesquieu (51), Godefroy (48), Gagnier (48), Le Clerc (41), and Voltaire (41). Incidentally, Professor Low's statement in his *Edward Gibbon* (1937), pages 119-120, is quite well founded. He states: "It is often assumed rather easily that Gibbon was a disciple of Voltaire. Voltaire's influence either on Gibbon's philosophy or history should be admitted with great reserve. Gibbon admired Voltaire as a dramatist immensely. As a historian—he found him superficially brilliant." Gibbon seldom refers to Voltaire's historical works, yet among general writers Voltaire is quoted only less than Montesquieu, largely because of the special nature of the latter's work, particularly his references to and study of Roman history.

We may ascertain the extent of his French bias from his references to the works of travellers. To Harris's comprehensive *Bibliotheca Navigantium atque Itinerantium* he makes only five references, to Churchill's monumental collection of voyages none at all, his account of America is drawn from the French *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains*, and the travels of Sir John Chardin are quoted from the French edition only. Again, the 128 references to D'Anville contrast strangely with the 24 occasions on which Hudson's *Geographos Minores* is referred to, despite the great merits of this latter work.

A strange feature in the work of Gibbon is the omission of any allusion to the learned magazines of England. Yet this is not surprising; apart from the work of Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon himself, English writers were antiquarians rather than historians and their interests are reflected in the pages of the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the Reviews. This same antiquarianism with its resultant restriction of study has led to English writers being seldom quoted extensively, except of course in the chapters on the early history of Christianity, in which the interest in theological questions which is so marked a feature of eighteenth-century English literature is reflected. There are 55 references to Pocock, 36 to Sale, 30 to Hume, and 29 to Ockley, but the other English authors are seldom mentioned.

Gibbon's study of Italian, begun in 1760, was sufficiently intensive for him to refer in the original to Giannone's *History of Naples*, which had always possessed considerable attraction for him. In this study of Italian he reflected the interests of his age, as is evident from the success of Baretti, the number of Italian books published in London during the century, and the popularity of bilingual operatic libretti.

Despite this knowledge of Italian, the comparatively large number of references to Italian scholars is undoubtedly due to the continued use of Latin as the Language of international scholarship. The figures for German scholarship are considerably enlarged by the same fact. No less than 1,184 references are to works in Latin out of the total of 3,777 in the strictly contemporary group, representing a percentage of 31.3. The most important of the works written in Latin are: Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Pagi's *Critica*, Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Græca*, and from the preceding century Baronius's *Annales* and the works of Ducange.

The existence of a second international language, namely French, is proved by Gibbon's references to French editions of the works of Chardin, Mosheim, Spanheim, Sir W. Jones, Schmidt, and other writers, as well as to the *Bibliothèques*.

Thus we may claim that a study of Gibbon's references, allusions, and footnotes gives an interesting and, despite his bias, because of his range of reading, accurate picture of eighteenth-century scholarship, which was still largely French, though the German scholars, already noted for their thoroughness, were beginning to contest this Gallic supremacy.

I. W. J. MACHIN



## REVIEWS

**Studia Otiosa. Some Attempts in Criticism.** By R. WARWICK BOND. London: Constable & Co., Ltd. 1938. Pp. x+228. 7s. 6d. net.

THE editor of Lyly and other Elizabethan classics has occupied his well-earned leisure since his retirement from the Chair of English at University College, Nottingham, with a wide variety of studies, the fruit of which he presents to the public in this volume.

Of the nine essays here collected one deals with *The Art of Narrative Poetry*, four with Shakespearian subjects, two with the ancient classics, one with a German poem, and one with a French author. In these days of minute specialization it is refreshing to find a scholar who takes the whole field of European literature as his province, and is as much at ease in discussing an ode of Pindar or an essay of Montaigne as when he is indicating the sources of a Shakespearian comedy or analysing the character of Falstaff.

Professor Bond is seen at his best as an expository critic. The most satisfying essay in the volume is, perhaps, the study of Montaigne, a fine, cool, balanced estimate for which many readers will be grateful. The following passage is a typical specimen of the author's succinct and forcible style—the style of a first-rate lecturer—and also of his power of seizing the essential characteristics of his subject and expressing them in felicitous phrases :

It is not the least paradoxical circumstance about the whimsical old Gascon that he, the most garrulous of writers, should also be one of the fullest of matter. His fluency is never verbosity : he cares too much for truth to give us empty wind : he cares too little for style to utter mere confectionery. His very indifference to form earned him the distinction of introducing a new form to modern Europe—an excellent and delightful literary kind, that of the essay—the essence of which lies in its being a frank communication of personal freedom ; in its treatment of subjects, not as parts of a philosophic system but as separate and detached ; in its disclaimer alike of exhaustiveness and of conformity to received opinion. The correspondence of such a mode with Montaigne's special temperament is obvious. Perfect freedom in choice and handling of subject,

absolute indifference to authority either in what he said or how he said it—this, no less than this, was what he claimed : and the result has nobly vindicated the claim.

The expository essays or lectures on *The Pharsalia* of Lucan, *The Theban Eagle*, and Brant's *Das Narrenschiff* belong to the same class as the essay on Montaigne. The study of *Das Narrenschiff* is a delightful introduction (with excellent verse translations) to a German poem which every student of English literature knows by name, but which few have read even in extracts.

The Shakespearian studies include two excursions into a field which Professor Bond has made peculiarly his own. In an essay on *The Framework of the Comedy of Errors* he makes out a very good case for supposing some relationship to exist between Shakespeare's play and an Italian comedy, *L'Ammalata*, by Giovannaria Cecchi (1555), and in a study of the sources of *Timon of Athens* (*Lucian-Boiardo in Timon*) he demonstrates in convincing fashion the indebtedness of that play to Boiardo's *Timone Comoedia*. These careful and interesting researches go far towards proving that Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian literature and possibly of the Italian language was more considerable than critics have hitherto supposed. In a discussion of *The Puzzle of Cymbeline* Professor Bond suggests that this play should be regarded as part of the sequence of Shakespeare's Roman histories and as a link between the Roman and the British series. His contribution to the elucidation of the character of Falstaff is contained in an essay called *Falstaff as Vox Populi*. Most readers will be convinced by his argument that the function of Falstaff in the two parts of *Henry IV* is to provide that element of common humanity which was lacking in the earlier historical plays ; but he is surely mistaken when he tries to turn the fat knight into a kind of symbol of the English common people, those uneducated masses who, according to Professor Bond, are generally thriftless, fond of strong liquor, and distinguished by "a susceptibility to feminine charms of a pronounced type that may be better for the birthrate than for themselves." It may be asked whether these characteristics belonged exclusively to the English working class in Shakespeare's or in any other age. Surely they have been the mark of a large part of the aristocracy and the squirearchy from the Middle Ages down to the nineteenth century. If Falstaff represents any class at all it is not the common people. Shakespeare's sketches of working-class characters such as the

Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*, the Athenian "mechanics" in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the citizens in *Julius Cæsar*, and the shepherds in *A Winter's Tale* have little in common with the boon companion of Prince Hal. Like Sir Toby Belch, he is the representative rather of the bohemian, free-living, free-thinking, anti-puritan section of the aristocracy, the predecessor of the roystering cavaliers and of the rakes of the Restoration.

Taken as a whole this book should be of particular value to students who wish to broaden their knowledge of the background of English literature. Such readers may well forgive or overlook the outbursts against democracy and the modern world which occasionally trouble the serenity of the "gardens and the gallant walks" of Professor Bond's domain of scholarly ease.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

**The Trial and Flagellation with Other Studies in the Chester Cycle.** Edited by F. M. SALTER and W. W. GREG. The Malone Society Studies. 1935. Pp. viii + 172.

THE Malone Society has taken a brief holiday from its accustomed fields, and printed the "Trial and Flagellation" play in the Chester cycle from a MS. discovered by Professor F. M. Salter in the Enrolment Book of the Coopers' company at Chester. The MS. was written on August 22, 1599, by George Bellin, clerk to the Coopers' and Ironmongers' companies, the man who was already known to be the scribe of two MSS. of the complete cycle in the British Museum (Add. 10305 and Harley 2013). Although the new MS. is of no very great textual importance, its relationship with those already discovered reopens the question of their genealogy. In his Sandars lectures, printed in *The Library*, 1914, Dr. Greg had suggested a relationship which postulated as many lost exemplars as there are surviving manuscripts. Professor Salter now disputes this conclusion, and suggests a closer affinity with the official register of plays which used to be kept in the Town Hall. But Dr. Greg takes the opportunity of an appendix to review Professor Salter's arguments, and rejects them in favour of those put forward in his edition of the "Antichrist" pageant (Oxford, 1935).

Professor Salter quotes lavishly from the Coopers' and the Ironmongers' accounts. He is able to show that the Coopers produced their play in 1572 and 1574, but not from 1569 to 1571,

nor in 1575, in spite of injunctions from the mayor. And, more important, he is able to show that the plays of the "Flagellation" and of the "Crucifixion" were separate as early as 1422, and were probably not amalgamated until 1575, the year in which the last performances were held. It was previously believed that the amalgamated form, as it appears in Harley 2124, was the original.

The volume also contains the Manchester fragment of the Chester "Resurrection" and parallel texts of "Christ's Disputation with the Doctors" in the York and Chester cycles. Both are edited by Dr. Greg with full textual notes. To these are added the texts of the Lists and Banns, including a new List discovered by Professor Salter in Harley 2104. This volume, therefore, contains all the principal documents, except the plays themselves, for the history of the Chester cycle. This being so, it is a pity that Professor Salter has not quoted his authority for his account of the route taken by the pageants. He writes [pp. 25-6]: "The entire distance travelled by the pageants can be walked in ten minutes [evidently Professor Salter takes rapid strides]: and there is an easy downgrade from the Abbey Gates to the High Cross, and from the High Cross to the Castle. The last stand was on the Roodee. . . ." This differs from all accounts known to me. These imply that the pageants proceeded from the Abbey Gates to the Cross, from the Cross to Watergate Street, thence to Bridge Street, presumably through Weaver Street or Nicholas Street and Whitefriars, and from Bridge Street, presumably by way of Pepper Street and Newgate Street, to Eastgate Street. The Castle and the Roodee lie well off this circular route. They are not mentioned in the Banns; nor is it at all likely that they were used as stations. Narrow as the principal streets are, the Rows, which flank them at a higher level, would allow the audience further standing room under cover. There was therefore no need to seek an open space as far off as the Castle, which had no direct approach from the Cross until the nineteenth century, or on the Roodee, which would have involved a toilsome uphill journey for the returning pageants.

JOHN BUTT.

**The Sonnets of William Shakespeare & Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southampton ; Together with A Lover's Complaint and The Phoenix and Turtle.** Edited with an Introduction by WALTER THOMSON. Printed and sold for the Editor by Basil Blackwell, Oxford, and Henry Young & Sons, Ltd., Liverpool. 1938. Pp. viii+199. 12s. 6d. net.

MR. THOMSON is not an anti-Stratfordian, but the assumptions on which all his arguments rest, and which, at any rate, he does not attempt to conceal from us, are of precisely the same kind as those with which we have long been familiar in many more fantastic disquisitions. There is, for example, a broad and simple assumption about human nature in general and the artist in particular which may be expressed like this :

Perfect works can only be produced by perfect men ;  
The man from Stratford was not a perfect man :  
Therefore the man from Stratford did not write the plays.

There are more complex forms in which æsthetic values are curiously mingled with those of conventional morality or of mere prejudice, and which may express themselves in syllogisms of this kind :

All art produced by homosexuals must be unhealthy ;  
Shakespeare has been proved to be a homosexual :  
Therefore Shakespeare's art must be unhealthy.

(And the performance of his plays should be banned until his homosexuality has been disproved.)

All Jewish art is bad ;  
Shakespeare has been proved to be a Jew :  
Therefore Shakespeare's art is bad.

(And, pending further investigation into his heredity, the performance of his plays should be banned.)

Substitute for 'homosexual' or 'Jew' in the major premiss 'Roman Catholic,' 'Bourgeois,' 'Fornicator,' 'Adulterer,' 'Snob,' or whatever happens to be the critic's particular obsession, and the same conclusion will be reached—unless, indeed, the offending passage or passages which have brought Shakespeare into the minor premiss can be explained away by means of fantastic misinterpretations.

A well-founded admiration, like a well-founded philosophy of life, should be incapable of having the bottom knocked out of it by the sudden emergence or discovery of a particular fact; and this, unfortunately, is what seems to have happened to Mr. Thomson's life-long admiration for Shakespeare when, comparatively late, it appears, he turned to the Sonnets and encountered Dr. Schmidt's Lexicon. Puzzled by the opening lines of the twentieth sonnet,

A womans face with natures owne hand painted,  
Haste thou the Master Mistris of my passion

he consulted Dr. Schmidt and learnt, to his horror, that 'Master Mistris' meant 'a male mistress, one loved like a woman but of male sex,' and that 'passion' meant 'amorous desire.' Now, although Dr. Schmidt's interpretation is almost certainly misleading, the passion it inspired in Mr. Thomson was stronger, and, alas! less worthy than 'that faintest of all human passions, the love of truth.' Believing, as he apparently did for a time, that Dr. Schmidt was right, he should have revised his ideas about homosexuality; instead, he seems to have felt it necessary to revise his admiration for Shakespeare:

When the 20th Sonnet and its implications were brought to our notice, we were disturbed and for nearly a year we lost our keenness for Shakespeare, which was no insignificant deprivation. In our state of ignorance we slipped into a morass where we were puzzled and unhappy.

If Mr. Thomson had had a finer feeling for the subtle, iridescent, and hyperbolical language of the Sonnets, he would not, perhaps, have allowed the meaning of these two lines to be so definitely fixed for him by Dr. Schmidt. If, with Shakespeare's printer, we omit the hyphen, *Master Mistris* will mean 'supreme mistress'; if we insert the hyphen it will mean that the 'mistress' usually invoked by poets is in this case a 'master.' As for *passion*, it is used, like the Latin *passio*, in a much more general sense than that of to-day: the best commentary on it is the use of *flame* in No. 109,

O never say that I was false of heart,  
Though absence seem'd my flame to quallifie.

Nor, even if all Shakespeare's expressions of affection for his friend are taken at their face-value, is it necessary to assume that the affection was at all abnormal. There is nothing in the Sonnets



more astonishing to our present ideas and conventions than the following passage from the *Religio Medici*, aptly quoted by Brandes :

I never yet cast a true affection on a woman, but I have loved my friend as I do virtue, my soul, my God. . . . I love my friend before my self, and yet methinks I do not love him enough. . . . When I am from him, I am dead till I be with him ; when I am with him, I am not satisfied, but would still be nearer him.

These reflections, however, did not occur to Mr. Thomson in the morass ; what helped him out was the not very original discovery of Mrs. Carmichael Stopes that *passion*, in Elizabethan times, could mean, among other things, *poem* or *emotional poem*. Thus, 'the Master Mistris of my passion' meant no more than 'the femininely beautiful man who is the subject of my poem.' What poem ? The choice was not large, so, guided, apparently, by M. François Victor Hugo's suggestion that it alluded to the vicissitudes in the pre-marital relationship between Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon, Mr. Thomson plumped for *A Lover's Complaint*. He did not stop there ; his heart had been 'expanded by a successful experiment,' and he proceeded to 'frolick in conjecture.' Not only were the Sonnets addressed to Southampton, several of them, we are told, were written by him in reply, and his claims to authorship are supported by such arguments as these :

In No. 35 Shakespeare with no uncertain voice takes his friend to task for his 'trespass,' his 'amiss,' his 'sins,' his 'sensual fault.' Yet, strangely if Shakespeare was the author of all the Sonnets, the next, No. 36, tells of 'my bewailed guilt.' If this reply could be supposed to be from the offending friend there would be no difficulty in understanding it.

No. 125 :

Noe, let me be obsequious in thy heart,  
And take thou my oblation, poore but free,  
Which is not mixt with seconds, knows no art,  
But mutuall render onely me for thee.

Does it not seem possible that the words 'mutual render' are intended to tell us in this—as we take it—Shakespeare's final Sonnet, that two pens, not one, produced the collection of which No. 126 is the end ?

To which there is only one reply : no, it does *not* seem possible. Mr. Thomson goes on to remark, very truly, that 'It would have been easier to apportion the Sonnets to Shakespeare and Southampton respectively if we had had some earmarked examples of



Southampton's work from some other source.' There are other difficulties: No. 74, with its *fell arest, with out all bayle*, and its *coward conquest of a wretches knife*, and No. 52, with its *To make some speciall instant speciall blest*, suggest that Southampton had begun to turn out some very tolerable imitations of Shakespeare.

But it is in the last three chapters that the insane root of which Mr. Thomson has eaten begins to exert its full power. We learn that the *Poeticall Essaies* in *The Phoenix and Turtle* have no connection with Chester's poem, and that they were a tribute from his theatrical friends to the imprisoned Southampton. What exactly they were trying to tell him is not made clear: presumably that they knew that he knew that they knew that Mr. W. S. was not the only sonneteer in a country. Southampton is the Phoenix and Shakespeare the Turtle—although Shakespeare is also, for a moment, the treble-dated crow, getting his own back on the owlish ghost of Greene, who had called him an upstart crow. The ten lines beginning

Single Natures double name  
Neither two nor one was called

mean that Shakespeare and Southampton had 'shed their surnames or double names and could only be recognized by what remained—their Christian names'—Mr. W(illiam) H(enry), in fact.

And now, what is Mr. Thomson going to do about *my flame* in No. 109, one of Southampton's sonnets? It is quite as easy to read what Mr. Thomson calls 'the worst' into it as into the *my passion* of No. 20; and to write sonnets to a man guilty of 'the worst' is surely not much better than being guilty of 'the worst' oneself.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

**Shakespeare's Hamlet, the Second Quarto, 1604**, reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Huntington Library. With an Introduction by OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. San Marino, California, 1938. Pp. 16+102 pp. in collotype. \$3.50 (or together with the First Quarto, \$5.00). (London: H. Milford, 16s. net.)

THIS collotype facsimile of the second quarto of *Hamlet* was very well worth producing, especially as the Griggs lithograph has for some time been obtainable only in complete sets of the "Shakspeare Quarto Facsimiles," while at the same time this quarto is to the

student perhaps the most interesting and important of all. The copy reproduced is that which was formerly in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire and is the same as that reproduced by Griggs. It is a good copy and the number of readings in it which are at all doubtful are few: a list of such as there are is given in the introduction. The editor says, however, (p. 14) that "in instances where exact readings are doubtful in both the original and collotype no attempt has been made to suggest any reading." It is, I think, a pity that the instances referred to are not listed, as readers may be left with the impression that an indefinite number of the original readings are really in doubt, whereas the fact is, as is usual with copies of Elizabethan books which have come down to us in a moderately good condition, there is seldom or never any doubt as to the letters intended, though occasionally a damaged *f* may have been used for a long *s*, a turned *n* for a *u*, a worn comma for a full stop, or *vice versa*. If in the present text there are really any such genuine doubtful readings as the editor seems to suggest, it would surely have been worth while to enquire whether they are clear in any other of the six extant copies of this edition (including those dated 1605).

The brief introduction by Professor O. J. Campbell gives a summary of the accepted views about the quarto, touching in particular on the probable relationship between this text and Shakespeare's manuscript.

The facsimile, in common with several others of recent date, suffers from what seems to me a grave defect in that it offers no means of reference to any ordinary modern text, and it is therefore exceedingly difficult to find any particular passage in it. In the present case, indeed, the difficulty can to some extent be overcome by using the Griggs facsimile, which has so far as possible the Globe line numbers as a key, but the method is at best clumsy. Had references for the first and last line of each page been added in the lower margin, as was done in the Clarendon Press facsimile of the First Folio, this would have been better than nothing.

R. B. McK.

**Shakespeare's Young Lovers.** By ELMER E. STOLL. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. x+118. 6s. net.

PROFESSOR STOLL's book consists of a revision and enlargement of the Alexander Lectures delivered at the University of Toronto in 1935. His choice of subject was, he admits, influenced by the occasion, since "in a spoken discourse character is easier to handle than structure or style." The lecture-form has also manifestly influenced his approach, which is here appreciative rather than analytical; and his style, though learnedly allusive, does not perform the contortions which admirers of his Shakespearian studies have learnt to accept. In fact, this is hardly a typical Stoll. "Beatrice is the most mettlesome," "Rosalind is the heartiest," "Viola is the sweetest": these phrases respectively introduce three pleasant flights of description, containing nothing to justify one's initial hope that the famous charm of the romantic heroines would at last have met its match. For the most part Professor Stoll, like the majority of his predecessors, has been bewitched out of criticism.

The range of these lectures is simple and a little belies their title. Romeo is the only male lover to come in for much notice; there is nothing of *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Two Gentlemen*, *The Shrew*, or *All's Well*, and very little of *Troilus and Cressida*, although all these would be required in a serious treatment of the subject. (Beatrice surely deserves to be linked not only with Congreve's Millamant but with Shakespeare's own Rosaline, Katharina, and Cleopatra: all in their different ways are studies of the untamed and untameable in woman, and of the keen antagonism which Shakespeare perceived in love.) But although Professor Stoll does often detach his "maidens", as he calls them, from their structural context and from a complete picture of Shakespeare's developing art, he never detaches them from their own words, and he does not claim that they are realistic characters. Repeatedly and suggestively he demonstrates how the movement of the verse expresses them; constantly he reminds us that they are not psychological studies. In his view, love at first sight and credulity of slander are "short cuts, contrivances to that end highly desirable in drama—compression and intensity." "What interests Shakespeare, and should interest us, is not so much the motives but what is moved; that is, the action, of which the characters are a part but not the source." The

holiday spirit of most of this book should not distract its readers from the amount to be pondered on in such statements as these. Their implications especially elucidate many of the "difficulties" in the character of Imogen, which Professor Stoll discusses in a passage of considerable value; but to follow Dowden's emendation of "Think that you are upon a rock" to "upon a *lock*" or wrestling grip, is surely "to explain what no reader has found difficult."

As one would expect, Professor Stoll will have no autobiographical nonsense about Shakespeare's late plays, and he hits out briefly and impartially at various popular hypotheses. But it is possible to support his main contention without admitting his argument that the very idea of an Elizabethan's seeking spiritual consolation in his native countryside is ridiculous. The thirteenth song of Drayton's *Polyolbion* (1612) shows that the idea had occurred to at least one Elizabethan.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

**England's Musical Poet: Thomas Campion.** By M. M. KASTENDIECK. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. 203. \$3.50; 14s. net.

MR. KASTENDIECK's main theme is (1) to show "how music had a material effect in conditioning the Elizabethan lyric"; (2) to establish a claim that Campion, in the joint capacity of author and composer, did more to raise the Elizabethan "Ayre" to its high position as an Art-form than any of his contemporaries.

He has spared no pains in studying the details of his subject, and his Bibliography at the end of the book is evidence of this. But his earlier chapters contain much that has already been said in other books, and one is constrained to wonder whether a book on Elizabethan music will one day be written in which no mention is made of Morley's overworked story of the scholar's discomfort at the supper-party of musicians, or a full quotation given of Byrd's famous "Reasons" for singing.

The most interesting part of this book is that which deals with the controversy on the subject of rhyming (Chapter V). Separate chapters are devoted to "The Musician as Poet" and "The Musical Poet," a rather nice point of distinction, it may be thought. It is, however, in Chapters V to VII that Mr. Kastendieck really tackles his main subject, and on the whole he has done this well.

It may seem that too much importance is made of the idea, as expressed by Mr. Davey and quoted by Mr. Kastendieck, that "the poems and the music were simultaneously conceived." A man may be both a poet and a musician; others less famous than Campion have, since his day, set their own words to music; but in every case the words must inevitably come first, even if the musical melody should occasionally have been designed when no more than a single stanza of the lyric had been written. Mr. Kastendieck rightly draws attention to the subtle skill with which Campion makes not only the accentuation, but also the idea contained in the words, conform in subsequent stanzas to the musical phrases of his first stanza; and his case loses nothing by a frank quotation from "It fell on a summers day" as an example of failure in this detail. But it should be remembered that in the original Editions of the Ayres of all the English lutenists it was customary to print no more than the first stanza in conjunction with the music; the rest of the lyric was printed in metrical form away from the music.

It must also be pointed out, though Mr. Kastendieck does not seem to have done so, that the musical side of Campion's work was slight as compared with that of Dowland or Morley, for example. Scarcely one of his Ayres is of a type that made serious demands upon his skill as a musician. He rarely, if ever, did more than invent a simple melody, wonderfully suited to its purpose it is true, but following the direct outline of the words, and often economizing by repeating the musical material of his first two lines in the third and fourth. A glance at the original editions will show what a very small portion of the page was needed for the musical setting. The accompaniments are almost all of the simplest kind of harmonization.

A few general comments on Mr. Kastendieck's work may be added. That Campion's music and words are inseparable if the beauty of his Ayres is fully to be realized, is no new discovery. This truth was plainly asserted by Vivian nearly thirty years ago.

In emphasizing the importance of the Campion-Rosseter book in 1601 Mr. Kastendieck seems to have overlooked Dowland's second book (1600); the first eight songs of that book have no alternative setting as part-songs, and are among the most remarkable of all the Ayres of the period. Nor does he mention Morley's book (also 1600) which consists entirely of solo Ayres. Both these are of far greater importance than Cavendish's Ayres, which he cites. Mr. Kastendieck also mentions in this connection "the Booke of

Ayres" of Robert Jones (1601). This was Jones's second book, the first was published in 1600.

It is to be regretted that the illustrations should not all have been reproduced with the original notation and barring, seeing that it was available from photostats.

It would have been interesting, too, to read some suggestion as to why the fascinating "Rose-cheeked Laura" was apparently not set to music by Campion; and it is strange that the splendid passionate Ayre "The cypress curtain of the night" calls for no comment.

The absence of an index is a matter to be remedied in a further edition. Among a few misprints: on page 52 the Latin word *nostris* should be *nostris*. On page 107 "Thou art faire" should read "Thou are not faire." On page 29 "some two thousand madrigals" ought to read "nearly one thousand madrigals"; and in the Preface, the first-name of Dr. Fellowes is Edmund not Edward.

E. H. FELLOWES.

**John Donne and the New Philosophy.** By C. M. COFFIN.  
New York: Columbia University Press; London: H.  
Milford. 1937. Pp. x+311. 17s. 6d. net.

THE student of to-day who has not taken all knowledge to be his province would seem to be at a distinct disadvantage in his approach to seventeenth-century literature. Recent studies of the "climates" of philosophic, scientific, and religious opinion in this age have thrown valuable light upon the intellectual background against which its authors wrote; but they have at the same time so broadened the basis of literary investigation that the average student is scarcely capable of criticizing from first-hand knowledge the data and conclusions of his guide in any one line of thought. The quality of the guide's scholarship is therefore an important consideration. In Professor Coffin the student who would learn something of Donne's poetic reactions to the scientific revolution of the late Renaissance has a guide who is master of his subject, who combines detailed acquaintance with the scientific writings of Donne's age with a sympathetic understanding of Donne's poetic mind, and who rarely forgets that his ultimate object is literary appreciation.

After an acute introductory discussion of the general relations



of poetry and science Professor Coffin proceeds to trace Donne's intellectual development chronologically, so far as our knowledge of Donne's biography permits. His early education under Jesuit tutors and at Oxford was along the traditional lines of mediæval scholasticism, but his transfer to Cambridge, with its anti-scholastic, anti-Aristotelian tendencies, provided a stimulus to a more liberal outlook. Donne's early poems may, as Professor Coffin suggests, presuppose the doctrines of scholastic philosophy and the Ptolemaic conception of the universe, but they do not prove his intellectual belief in them. In the late 1590's, indeed, Donne was becoming increasingly convinced of the vanity of human learning, and, without in any way rejecting the world of books, he came to rely more and more upon himself and to indulge his own speculative intellect. In the early years of the seventeenth century this found rich material in the achievements of the new philosophy. Professor Coffin's analysis of the old scholastic philosophy and his account of the rise of the new Copernican philosophy clearly illuminate the transitional intellectual world in which Donne was now feeling his way. How eagerly he kept pace with the new learning is suggested, for instance, by allusions to Kepler's *De Stella Nova* (Prague, 1606) in *Biathanatos* (1608), and to Galileo's *Sidereus Nuncius* (Venice, 1610) in *Ignatius his Conclave* (1611), and, even more significantly, by his employment of imagery and ideas drawn from the new astronomy in his poetry, for example in "A Valediction: forbidding mourning" (1611). Donne's sensitive response to these new ideas is, however, no proof that he accepted them in their entirety. Their immediate effect, indeed, was to reinforce his scepticism, for, as "The First Anniversary" shows, the "new Philosophy calls all in doubt."

The chapters which Professor Coffin devotes to a detailed study of the reflection of various aspects of the Copernican philosophy in Donne's prose and verse bring us appreciably nearer to an adequate interpretation not merely of individual images but of the general substance of his writings and of the mental processes which determined their creation. The quality of Donne's scholarship is favourably analysed, Professor Coffin boldly proving his case from the apparently unpromising text of *Biathanatos*. Donne is held to have shown, both here and elsewhere, "a genuine sympathy for all sound learning and valid human experience," and to have consistently employed old authors in the spirit of his own claim in



*Pseudo-Martyr*: "I have nowhere made any Author, speak more or lesse, in sense, then hee intended, to that purpose, for which I cite him." But Donne was not ruled by authority: his innate scepticism and profound originality forbade that. The conclusion to which Professor Coffin's illuminating study leads him is that Donne, in an age of intellectual ferment and transition, was certain of one thing, "and that is the reality of his own experience and the sensitive machine of self which has this experience."

F. E. BUDD.

**The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery.**

Edited by W. S. CLARK, II. Two volumes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1937. Vol. I, pp. xvi+514; vol. II, pp. viii+515-966. \$10.00; 42s. net.

MR. CLARK has carried out with conspicuous success a piece of work that fulfils a real need. Previously the only edition of Roger Boyle's dramatic works was that published in 1739 by the efforts, it would seem, of his great-grandson, John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery. That edition, in two octavo volumes, contains only six plays from Roger's own pen, while it includes an adaptation of his play, *The Generall*, renamed *Altemira*, and also a comedy entitled *As You Find It*, both by Roger's grandson, Charles Boyle. Mr. Clark has added four other plays, one of which, *Zoroastres*, has hitherto existed only in a single MS. once belonging to Sir Thomas Browne's family and thence passing to Sir Hans Sloane and the British Museum. Of the other three additional plays, *The Generall*, which had been inadequately edited (and ascribed to Shirley) by Halliwell-Phillipps, is now carefully collated with the MS. in Worcester College, Oxford; *Mr. Anthony* is re-edited from the quarto text of 1690; and *The Tragedy of King Saul* from the quarto of 1703 and the duodecimo of 1739.

Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *Handlist of editions*, in his *Restoration Drama*, was inevitably incomplete, and Mr. Clark is to be congratulated on discovering half a dozen items hitherto unrecorded. Bibliographical details of twenty-five texts of individual plays are fully described in an Appendix. In another appendix details of thirteen manuscripts are given. As the editor observes, the bibliography of Orrery is far more complicated than had been suspected.

The thoroughness with which he has carried out his task may be judged from the fact that he has collated *Henry the Fifth* from no less than seven printed editions and five MSS.; *Mustapha* from seven editions and four MSS.; and *Tryphon* from three editions and two MSS. The textual notes recording variants and the editor's emendations take up 120 pages. In preparing his work Mr. Clark has availed himself of the resources of the principal libraries of Oxford, London, and the American Universities, and he has duly recorded his indebtedness to these as well as to numerous individual scholars. Five copyright reproductions of designs by John Webb for *Mustapha* from the Chatsworth collection provide an interesting and valuable embellishment. The two volumes constitute a model of editorial industry and finished workmanship, to which publishers and printers have contributed in no small measure.

For each play Mr. Clark has followed the most reliable text scrupulously but not slavishly. All variants from the chosen text, with one or two minor exceptions, are shown in the Textual Notes. Abbreviations of characters' names have been silently standardized, and in those plays following manuscript texts, *The Generall* and *Zoroastres*, the editor has made silent corrections in punctuation and capitalization, as well as those occasioned by the writing out in full of such abbreviations as "&" for "and" and "pty" for "party." The spelling of names of characters, where given in full, and of "than" for "then," has been regularized throughout; all changes made in consequence, however, have been duly recorded in the Textual Notes. There can be no doubt that Mr. Clark has succeeded in establishing a text that will be accepted as authoritative and permanent. A striking example of the value of his examination of manuscript sources occurs in *Henry the Fifth*, where at the beginning of Act III two lines that appear only in the MSS. are absolutely necessary to make sense of the dialogue. Such minor triumph in the course of the editor's labours on the text is of course merely incidental. The real value of these labours lies perhaps less in the achievement of a sound text than in the evidence they present of the circumstances and methods of text transmission.

In a well-documented Historical Preface Mr. Clark gives for the first time an adequate biography of Orrery, containing much new information about his life and about the history and influence of his dramatic work. The biography makes no pretence at completeness. The aim is rather to show a "revelation of a changing

personality" whose excursions in the field of drama were in the nature of a pleasant diversion in the midst of a busy life. Mr. Clark has drawn largely on unpublished State Papers and letters and manuscripts scattered throughout many libraries. Details of Orrery's political and military activities, which form the bulk of the material, have been wisely curtailed to make room for those relating to his literary activities. Of these the most important is his pioneer work in the heroic drama of the Restoration, a special topic which Mr. Clark has previously discussed in earlier volumes of this periodical.<sup>1</sup> He now gives evidence in full to support his view that *The Generall* was Orrery's first attempt at playwriting and the first English heroic play in the strict sense of the term. Of equal significance is the fact that Orrery was one of the first of the nobility to set a fashion for writing plays for the public theatre, a fashion characteristic of Restoration drama.

A separate Critical Preface treats of the individual plays, tracing the development and the decline of Orrery's powers. Mr. Clark considers the climax was reached in *Herod the Great*, a play which, though unacted, he suggests is worthy to be ranked immediately after the best plays of Dryden, Lée, and Otway. He emphasizes two distinctive features that give this and Orrery's other heroic plays marked individuality. One of these features, described as "ethical argumentation" or elaborate disputation over the delicate problems of love and honour, can be traced to pre-Restoration modes, as Professor Harbage has shown. But Mr. Clark maintains that Orrery was even more strongly influenced by the prevalent French fashion, particularly in the adoption of rhyme as the most effective medium for the battledore and shuttlecock mode of argument. The other typical feature of Orreryan drama is the exalted tone of heroic virtue which permeates both plot and characters. Here a degree of refinement is reached that is not found in later heroic drama, which is more concerned with physical acts of valour than with magnanimity of heart and mind. This element of refinement, too, Mr. Clark attributes to French rather than to Cavalier precedent.

In the canon of plays ascribed to Orrery, *The Tragedy of King Saul* is accepted on grounds which some may consider open to doubt. The external evidence is slight, based mainly on a reference in the Dedication to the Countess of Burlington, who is there "said to be

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.* II (1926), pp. 206-11; VIII (1932), pp. 437-44.

related to the Noble Person, who is suppos'd to be the Author of it (*i.e.* the play)." The evidence on stylistic grounds is even less convincing. Mr. Clark cites only one couplet which he parallels in Orrery's earlier play, *Mustapha*; but he is constrained to admit that the verse shows very marked inferiority to that of *Herod the Great*, written only a few years previously. He also points out elsewhere that the characteristic conflicts of love versus love, love versus duty, love versus revenge are absent from the later drama, remarking that this play, written in "humpty-dumpty verse," is merely "a themeless dramatization of a segment of Hebrew history." It would appear that it was Horace Walpole who first hazarded the guess that the author of *King Saul* was Orrery; but the letter, dated 1758, where the allusion occurs asks for confirmation, and no answer is recorded. Incidentally the ascription of the play to Dr. Joseph Trapp, mentioned in *Biographia Britannica*, is shown to be baseless.

One of the most interesting and valuable features of the book is the emphasis placed on the theatrical rather than on the literary aspects of Orrery's productions. Before the Explanatory Notes to each play there is a full description, with commentary, of the staging; and also a more complete account of the players than can be found elsewhere in any one work. Mr. Clark shows how Orrery mastered and utilized the facilities afforded by the increasingly elaborate stage mechanics. An excellent example of detailed examination occurs in the account of the staging of *Guzman*: no less than nineteen scene-divisions are tabulated, and it is shown clearly and fully how ten different locales of action were adjusted to fit seven distinct sets of scenery. From this and other plays much valuable evidence is given of the methods of scene-changing, the use of back- and wing-flats, of the proscenium curtain and many other stage devices. The amount of material provided would indeed fill a separate treatise, and should prove indispensable to future historians of the Restoration Stage.

D. M. WALMSLEY.

**The Polite Marriage ; also The Didactic Lyre, The Bristol Milkwoman, The Scotch Parents, Clio in Motley, and Mary Hays, Philosophess : Eighteenth-Century Essays.** By J. M. S. TOMPKINS. Cambridge University Press. 1938. Pp. viii+209. 10s. 6d. net.

IN this sequel to her excellent work *The Popular Novel in England, 1770-1800* (1932), Miss Tompkins has expanded her findings on James White, Mary Hays, and the Griffiths, and added three new studies of obscure representatives of the minor literature of the same era. The big people who make any appearance here, such as Hannah More and her sister, Horace Walpole, Fanny Burney, Mrs. Montagu, Bishop Hervey, the fastidious and elegant Miss Seward, or William Godwin, come in as minor characters, in comparison with the principals, writers who have long ago vanished from the pages of literary criticism, if they ever appeared there. It is pleasant to hear more about the burlesque historical romances of James White, who, like Peacock a little later, hits out at contemporary politics in his merry version of the deeds of Strongbow, John of Gaunt, and Richard Cœur-de-Lion ; of Mary Wollstonecraft's friend, Mary Hays, author of what Ernest Bernbaum calls "that revolutionary novel" *Emma Courtney* ; and of the once-celebrated pair of married lovers, Richard and Elizabeth Griffith, who delighted in letting the world at large enjoy their love-letters, and went on concocting sentimental novels when their own romance seemed to be played out—novels laden with sentiments but not sentimentalities. Their tale and that of divers others is told almost in the manner of a quiet but searching domestic novel, so kindly and humorously are the quaint characters hit off and their variable moods and little estrangements and reconciliations chronicled, against a background of curious, admiring, or cynical spectators. Often the situation, as Miss Tompkins notes, could "be matched . . . in the pages of those women writers who were soon almost to appropriate the novel." The story in "The Scotch Parents" of the young spark who takes advantage of the innocence and affectionate disposition of a milliner's assistant, and when her parents insist on taking her away confronts them with a printed account of the affair in the form of a novel, is itself a piquant novelette, with quite a satisfactory denouement. Ramble has, deservedly, to put up with the loss of his Nell, for as she was still a minor he could not cut the

gordian knot by marrying her out of hand. He is conjecturally identified with the John Carter, who published *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture and Painting* (1780).

Mary Hays is better known; there are two books relating to her by Miss A. F. Wedd. But she too is the subject of an intimate study of character and sentiments. Nor is gentle wit and humour lacking in the sketches of the medical poet, Dr. Hugh Downman, and Hannah More's protégée, Ann Yearsley, the humble Bristol poetess who for a while, as Mr. E. H. W. Meyerstein recently pointed out, "usurped the city's laurels," which had to be restored to Chatterton as the result of an organized movement. The medical poetaster rhymed of such exalted themes as

"Tertian, corrosive scurvy, or moist catarrh,"

and of "Nature's chymic mixture" which flows

Gently detersive, purifying, bland;  
This each internal Obstacle removes,  
And sets in motion the young Springs of Life.

Miss Tompkins must be congratulated on such a find, nor less on having rediscovered such a mistress of bathos as Mrs. Yearsley, of whose rustic it is averred,

The landscape rushes on his untaught mind,  
Strong raptures rise, but raptures undefined;

and whose derogatory epitaph runs,

Ann Yearsley tasted the Castalian stream  
And skimmed its surface as she skimmed her cream;  
But struck at last by fate's unerring blow  
All that remains of Ann is—"Milk below."

Well attested with dates, authorities, and abundant quotations, as well as with the shrewd insight of the psychological exegesis, these papers are a scholarly contribution to the history of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. They are neither patronizing nor too unkind in their raillery. What will our own minor literature look like if similarly resuscitated a century hence?

ERNEST A. BAKER.

**Power and Elusiveness in Shelley.** By O. W. FIRKINS.  
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London:  
H. Milford. 1937. Pp. iv+187. \$2.50; 11s. 6d. net.

THE late Professor Firkins, who died in 1932, was for many years a distinguished figure in the academic life of America, and will be



remembered as a versatile scholar and an original and graceful essayist. It would have helped our appreciation of this, presumably the last of his posthumous publications, if we had been told something of the circumstances of its appearance after so long an interval, and, in particular, whether there is any reason to suppose that the author considered it ready for the press. On the latter point, in the absence of any authoritative statement, the reader can hardly avoid a certain doubt. In *Selected Essays*, the only one of his earlier works known to the British Museum, the author displays a natural power of exposition and a cultivated literary style, as well as critical discernment. The present book has hardly any trace of these characteristics except in the slight introductory paragraphs beginning each chapter. The rest consists mainly of one series after another of classified quotations strung together by short connecting sentences, such as "The following is noteworthy," "He likens Time to a bird," "He is fond of fading or fitful winds," "Sounds of terror are strongly pictured," "Drinking, chiefly in metaphor, is not uncommon." There is much to justify the suspicion that some zealous literary executor has mistaken for the manuscript of a book what was really a set of lecture notes intended to be expanded orally. That seems to be the most reasonable explanation of passages like this (p. 93), which is fairly representative of those pages, apart from the introductory paragraphs already mentioned, which are not filled with quotations :

Among the properties of wind which endeared it to Shelley are : (1) its invisibility, which appealed to his rarefied imagination ; (2) the tender and caressing quality of its gentler movements, a type of the love he felt and sought ; (3) its power of interpenetration with other substances, with sunlight, moisture, or cloud ; (4) its office as purveyor or charioteer of various objects dear to Shelley : water, the clouds, the dead leaves, the winged seeds, sounds, and perfumes ; (5) its office in the propulsion of boats : Shelley's passion for boats is well known ; (6) its effects crisping the surface of the seas, lakes, fields, and the like ; and (7) its use as a symbol for religious or poetical inspiration.

The author's thesis is that Shelley's natural affinity was with the vast, the formless, the intractable, with abstract ideas, with the universal experience of the race. Some earlier critics who made the same discovery have mistaken this intense feeling for the sublime—which is evidently what Professor Firkins means by the sense of "power and elusiveness"—for a merely temperamental mysticism, or even for intellectual haziness. The reaction to the other extreme



was inevitable, and to-day we are asked to believe that Shelley combined within himself the distinguishing qualities of Sir Isaac Newton, Pitt, Napoleon, and Mr. Henry Ford. The effect of the present work is to reassert the essential truth of the older view without exaggerating or distorting it. The task was appropriate to the hand of a veteran; and the student of Shelley will find pleasure in what has been accomplished while regretting the cause of its apparent incompleteness.

P. L. CARVER.

**Keats as Doctor and Patient.** By Sir WILLIAM HALE-WHITE, K.B.E. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. 96. 5s. net.

THIS is an attempt to set out the facts of Keats's medical apprenticeship and years at Guy's Hospital and to determine the precise nature of the disease that caused his death, with any conditions contributory thereto. With regard to the first, Sir William Hale-White finds that Keats was a conscientious and efficient student and dresser, that he qualified at the earliest possible age, one year before the complete term, and that he took careful and intelligent notes of Astley Cooper's lectures. He concludes, however, that he finally and definitely decided not to practise. In respect of the disease from which Keats died, the author is assured that this was tubercular consumption of the lungs, contracted while nursing his brother Tom in 1818; that it was not hereditary, nor derived from his mother, who may or may not have died of consumption, but was due to breathing in tubercle bacilli while acting as nurse; that the treatment to which he was submitted was highly deleterious, *e.g.* in respect of bleeding and of confinement to closed rooms; and that his voyage to Italy greatly weakened and distressed him, without any compensatory sanative relief. Sir William Hale-White acquits the medical men who attended Keats of any blame, their diagnosis and treatment being such as the science of the time approved; and points out that three eminent specialists were consulted. He further concludes that Keats's debility was in no sense caused by drink or drugs, and that his death was not hastened by the hostile reviews of the literary critics. He suggests, perhaps optimistically, that had Keats lived to-day, modern methods might have saved his life.

The book is written in a cool and dispassionate temper, and is modest and unpretentious in manner. Indeed, it suffers from a somewhat careless syntax and a loose and conversational phraseology. For example, the sentence "he used to buy all sorts of things he did not want, and when they came to his room he left them lying about for ages" has not the exactitude a finished style requires. Nor are Sir William Hale-White's literary criticisms incontrovertible or happy. "Perhaps the finest sonnet in our language," of "On first looking into Chapman's Homer," might befit the lips of "bold Cortez," but otherwise is redeemed only by the "perhaps." The accounts given, also, of Dr. Robert Bree, William Lambe, and James Clark, though interesting in themselves, are too discursive for the book and rather gossipy.

On one point Sir William seems to have fallen into error. He states that Keats's voyage to Naples took "over two and a half months." Yet he says himself that the ship sailed on September 18 and reached Naples on October 21. This, with ten days for quarantine, is one month and a half.

Several points of interest are made in these pages. It is depressing to read that Keats, according to the usage of his time, employed body snatchers, at four guineas a corpse, for his dissections; and more exhilarating, possibly, to learn that Keats's guardian would have made him, in default of a surgeon, a tea-broker or a hatter.

It must be stated that a severely scientific examination of Keats's medical attainments and fatal symptoms would have been more pertinent to the question. The essential fact is that Keats had a poetical endowment of a high or the highest order, but was cut short by a physical malady beyond his control. But the processes of his imagination in the ideal world of beauty and the agonies of his frustration by disease do not fall within the purview of the scientist. Yet this is a book which all students of Keats may approve; for it shows a kindly spirit and a natural piety not usually associated with the hospitals of his day.

T. E. CASSON.

Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed, *Reed's Memoir of Sara Coleridge, Her Letters to Reed and her Marginalia to Henry Crabb Robinson's Copy of Wordsworth's Memoirs*. Edited by N. BROUGHTON. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. 1937. Pp. xviii+117. 7s. net.

PROFESSOR BROUGHTON's edition of Henry Reed's *Memoir* and of various unpublished papers relative to Sara Coleridge forms a useful addition to our knowledge of the poet's distinguished daughter as well as of her correspondent, Wordsworth's American friend and editor. Reed's *Memoir* is a fitting tribute to a charming personality. Sara Coleridge chose to subordinate her own undoubted powers to her edition of her father's works and to her duties as a wife and mother, but that she inherited in a very marked degree the family gifts, which were in her case combined with industry, method, and steadiness of purpose, there is ample evidence in her writings and in the judgments of her friend. Reed's *Memoir* was originally published as an obituary notice in the (American) *Literary World*, but little or nothing needs to be discounted from his estimate on that account. The six letters to Henry Reed together with the *Comment* on his *Memoir of Thomas Gray* sufficiently illustrate her literary taste and acumen. The originals are in the Wordsworth Collection of Cornell University and only brief excerpts have previously been printed: the *Marginalia* have not hitherto appeared. Sara's criticisms of Wordsworth and of Christopher Wordsworth's *Memoirs* are of great interest. She claims, doubtless justly, that she understood and appreciated Wordsworth's poetry better even than his daughter, and it is particularly noteworthy that, in the words of her editor, "there is no indication" that she "thought of the ageing Wordsworth as declining in intellectual power. To her his character in old age was deep and strong, though greatly modified and adjusted from what it was in his early life." She characterizes the *Memoirs* admirably when she says that Christopher's "compilation of fragments and scraps of the great man's life of thought and action . . . does credit to the biographer's industry . . . though its merits as a literary performance are but negative. It does not positively misrepresent the subject, as Pickersgill's portrait, with neat, shiny boots, velvet waistcoat, and sombre sentimentalism of countenance misrepresents him, but it exhibits him partially,

disproportionately and brokenly." Yet she discriminates again and again between "those earlier odes" which "seem to be *organic wholes*" and works (like *The Triad* for example) which are "elegant compositions by a poetic artist—a poetical will-work, not as a whole . . . a piece of inspiration, though some lines in it are breathings of the poetic spirit." Very illuminating, too, is her estimate of the relations between Coleridge and Wordsworth: "My Father had no *master* among his contemporaries in poetry. He himself was in great measure the head and founder, I believe, of the Shelley, Keats, and Tennyson school" (she is writing in 1851) "in the more sensuous part of his poetry; but I think he combined more of the intellectual with this vein than his successors. It is not true in fact that W. W. was his *master* in any department of intellect except as one great mind must ever help to inform another with which it has intercourse." Interesting, too, are her remarks about Ruskin, especially (p. 30) in her distinction between "imitation and copying," and her appreciations of Gray and of Crabbe. The *Marginalia*, which the writer wished she had "rubbed out," also contain much which we should not willingly have spared.

The only disappointment in Professor Broughton's well-edited book is the index, which appears to have been compiled before the present numbering of the pages was determined. It gave the writer some trouble to discover that the entries are all twenty pages out, i.e. for *Virgil* 35 *note*, 71, we must read *Virgil* 15 *note*, 51, and so consistently.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

**The History of the English Novel. Vol. IX. The Day before Yesterday.** By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: H. F. and G. Witherby. 1938. Pp. 364. 16s. net.

FOURTEEN years after the publication of his first volume Professor Baker draws towards the close of his large *History of the English Novel*. The writers noticed in the volume before us belong to a generation which has just passed. A final volume is promised which will survey our contemporaries. The scale of the work, as Professor Baker's successive prefaces show, has outstripped his first intention. The range of his reading, the complexity of his material, the thoroughness, sometimes the diffuseness, of his method, have extended the survey to ten volumes which will contain well over

three thousand pages. He has written something more than a chronicle or a work of reference, for he has attempted to trace evolution, and the relation of the parts to the whole. He never hesitates to turn aside from his story to discuss changing characteristics, governing theories, the failure or success to achieve critical aims. Whenever a novelist has offered stated beliefs on the nature of his craft he is judged by his own doctrine.

In his first volume Professor Baker defined the novel as an attempt to analyse and interpret life by means of fictitious narrative in prose. The task of the novelist is analytical rather than creative. But, if in the main the distinction holds, there are, during the two centuries in which the novel has assumed recognizable form, creative exceptions. Have not Fielding and Scott and Dickens opened new windows upon life? It may be questioned whether it is safe to say as much of any novelist who appears in the volume under notice. The greatest among the names is that of Thomas Hardy. His vision of an inexorable fate brooding over the destiny of mortals, who pass their fretted lives upon the slopes of time, unconscious of the blind, irresistible forces about them, is imaginatively and dramatically presented, whether in the greater novels or in *The Dynasts*, but it is not new. It is as old as Greek tragedy. And when we turn to the other names in this volume the consciousness of creative power is lost. They are interpreters, like Gissing, Moore, and James, or frank entertainers and romancers. Nor is there much trace of related development, but a record rather of new beginnings.

Professor Baker writes judiciously of Hardy, reminding us that he was "a critic of life, not of personal character." And he remarks, not unaptly, that his novels may be regarded as "a grafting of late Elizabethan drama on prose fiction." It may be asked, however, whether in his emphasis upon Hardy's apparent multiplication of malicious coincidences he is wholly fair to the merits of his architectonic? Life often looks like that, especially to those involved in the tragedy. A major fault of Hardy's determinism was the insertion of philosophic strands, which protrude in jagged edges from the narrative, for he was not a clear or consistent thinker. Nor was he, despite the dramatic power of his work, the master of a style that was more than adequate.

The chapter on Gissing is singularly good. Professor Baker is both just and generous. George Moore is difficult to appraise; for he was inspired at different times by differing ideals, and he was

constantly weighing himself in the balance, to the confusion of admirers and critics. And Professor Baker, in his journey from *A Mummer's Wife* to *Aphrodite in Aulis*, is not wholly successful in making the reader conscious of Moore's greatness or of the sincerity beneath the pose. Charles Morgan's fine *Epitaph* may be an over-statement, but it is an interpretation; and Professor Baker somehow fails to interpret Moore.

The æsthetics and the circle of *The Yellow Book* are temperately and not too distantly discussed. Oscar Wilde is a little hardly treated. "In his stories and his one novel, and in most of his other writings . . . he was an adroit kleptomaniac." Wilde was a borrower, but he transformed much that he borrowed, and his work was more than a tissue of thefts. Perhaps Professor Baker did not mean to suggest as much as he seems to say. And it is pleasant to find in this chapter a generous appreciation of that true artist and craftsman Hubert Crackanor, whose early death wrecked high hopes. "Impeccable workmanship and a style of beautiful precision seemed to mark him out as a great novelist to be."

Professor Baker has read Henry James closely; he admires the exactness and scholarly character of his technique; and he succeeds in throwing "light on darkest James." But others may feel, with all acknowledgment to the novel as literature, that James was so engrossed with the surface play of mental phenomena that the characters in his typical novels scarcely reveal themselves in the flesh. Too often we seem to be scanning museum exhibits or watching reflections in mirrors. What is it that makes the people of Jane Austen, whose setting is even less eventful than that of James, living men and women, when his so often are pale shadows? But Professor Baker is an understanding admirer of Henry James, and worth careful reading by the sceptics. And indeed the whole of his long survey of the story of the English novel is an example of insight and protracted thoroughness.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**Thomas Hardy: A study of his Writings and their Background.** By W. R. RUTLAND. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1938. Pp. x+365. 21s. net.

THE object emphasized in this very searching study of the circumstances in which Hardy produced his successive works is to provide



information, though Dr. Rutland does not refrain from occasional criticism, and the sections concerned with *The Dynasts* are avowedly a personal interpretation. Yet another book on Hardy sounds alarming, but this one is justified both in its purpose and by its success. Dr. Rutland had the advantage of exploring the library at Max Gate before its dispersion, and of talks with Mrs. Hardy. Not a stone has been left unturned in the effort to find out what Hardy read, both in the formative period of boyhood and youth and during the seasonal changes of his thought after he became a writer. His early reading was far more in the poets than the novelists. When he began to write fiction, he was at a loss for a model and a method, and as everyone knows his first attempt had to be suppressed. Dr. Rutland has taken perhaps superfluous trouble to find out what sort of a poor thing was *The Poor Man and the Lady*, and how much of it afterwards went into *An Indiscretion in the Life of an Heiress*, *Desperate Remedies*, and *Under the Greenwood Tree*. Actually, in the earliest of his extant novels, *Desperate Remedies*, he tried to imitate Wilkie Collins. Dr. Rutland is in error in supposing that Madame Cazamian in 1923 was the first to notice this. The present reviewer duly chronicled the fact in his *Guide to the Best Fiction* (1903), in a note practically identical with one in an annotated catalogue of 1899. There was no original insight here; all the critics had made the same observation.

It is useful to have set out so many of Hardy's literal and other citations from the Bible and the Prayer Book. Then it is systematically shown that the English poets who exerted most influence on Hardy were his countryman Barnes, that other rural poet, Crabbe, Shelley and Keats, and, much later on, Swinburne. For Wordsworth he had less affinity; though it is worse than useless to regret profoundly that he "could not also have learnt the lesson which human life taught to the greater man," for the Wessex novels would have been something altogether different, and perhaps altogether inferior, if they had been written in the spirit of Wordsworth. Greek poetry was a still more potent inspiration. Dr. Rutland has spared no pains to show how much Hardy owed to Æschylus and Sophocles, somewhat strangely how little in comparison to Euripides, and among the Latin poets to Virgil. Æschylus deepened if he did not instil the "ethical significance" in Hardy's fiction—"tendency" is certainly not the word for this pervasive element. As to the philosophic significances or tendencies in his mature fiction, the same



care is applied to tracing the effect on Hardy's mind of his reading of Darwin, *Essays and Reviews*, the literature of the Colenso affair, and the rationalistic works of Spencer, Mill, Huxley, Leslie Stephen, and others, including Swinburne and James Thomson, author of *The City of Dreadful Night*. Swinburne's influence was tremendous, rivalling that of Æschylus; and it is good to have the verbal parallels and other evidences particularized. Dr. Rutland comes to much the same conclusion as Pierre d'Exideuil on the lateness and the comparatively minor nature of Hardy's indebtedness to Schopenhauer, once so much talked of, and the slighter effect of a limited acquaintance with Bergson, Nietzsche, and Hartmann. But he has substantiated his case far more thoroughly, and he has given similar care and fullness to the concluding study of the genesis and growth of *The Dynasts* and its place in Hardy's work and in European literature. He should not claim, however, that he is the first to point out how the characterization of the Spirits "carries the whole structure." He rightly exposes the logical inconsistency between Hardy's conception of the Immanent Will and the determination by which

things to be were shaped and set  
Ere mortals and this planet met.

Either idea is, of course, incompatible with that of "crass Casualty." But why qualify praise of that inimitable story "The Three Strangers" with the deprecatory clause "despite a leaning towards the *macabre*"? And in summarily dismissing so many of Hardy's short stories Dr. Rutland ignores another masterpiece of the *macabre*, "The Withered Arm," and a number of those in *A Group of Noble Dames* and *Life's Little Ironies*, for instance, "On the Western Circuit," that brilliant handling of a paradoxical theme. He calls *Tess* and *Jude* didactic novels, just as many astute critics who are afraid of seeming to countenance the faintest hint of edification scent a moral even in such a novel as Conrad's *Lord Jim*. Call many of Hardy's novels polemical if you like, too polemical for true art; but one might as well call *Macbeth* or *Othello* didactic.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

**Essays Historical and Literary.** By SIR CHARLES FIRTH.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1938. Pp. viii+247. 12s. 6d.  
net.

THE essays collected in this volume were written for widely different occasions and at different dates, that on John Bunyan appearing as early as 1898 in the form of an introduction to Methuen's edition of *Pilgrim's Progress*. They lend themselves admirably, however, to re-issue as a series that conveys to the reader a unity of motive not often to be found in such miscellanies. For through the chronological presentation of seven successive specimens of historical and semi-historical writing from the Elizabethan ballads to *Gulliver's Travels* it is possible to detect not only the individual characteristics of writers as far apart as Raleigh, the humanist adventurer, and Bunyan, the dissenting fanatic, but their relative value as historical authorities and precursors of modern historical methods. In the light of Sir Charles Firth's revaluation Raleigh's *History of the World* cannot be dismissed as merely a great prose classic or Milton's *History of Britain* as a literary curiosity, both representing substantial contributions to historical research as interpreted by their authors and by the age to which they belong. Raleigh "accepted and followed the Ciceronian conception of history," vindicating the case of the historian against Sidney's less sympathetic and avowedly biassed estimate by illustrating at length "the end and scope of al Historie, to teach by example of times past such wisdom as may guide our desires and actions." Combined with this humanistic theory is the Puritan conception of Divine Providence overruling human affairs, which accounts for the disproportion of Raleigh's first book, dealing with the history of the Jews. Milton, by comparison with the earlier chroniclers from whom he derived his material, is more sceptical and critical, endeavouring "to hold the balance between absolute credulity and complete rejection," as shown particularly in his preference for the more primitive records, especially in his account of Arthur, upon whom "his conclusions are roughly those of modern scholars, and his reasoning practically that of a scientific historian." The two essays on Clarendon and Burnet—the one a tercentenary lecture, the other an introduction to a biography—may be treated together as companion studies of the two outstanding historians of contemporary events over a continuous historical period; and the link

between them is strengthened by a most suggestive comparison between the two writers in question at the close of the essay on Burnet. To press the distinction between the "historical" and "literary" essays of the series would be injudicious, the author being preoccupied throughout with the historical significance of writings generally accepted as "literature" in the narrower sense of the term. Thus the historian and the general reader alike will find much of interest not only in the papers devoted to historians but also in the scholarly survey of the Elizabethan ballad, reprinted from *Shakespeare's England*, in the consideration of Bunyan's writings, especially in relation to their sources and analogues, and above all in the illuminating study of the allegory of *Gulliver's Travels* as a reflection of contemporary English and Irish politics. The collection as a whole affords ample proof of the fact that erudition properly used is in nowise synonymous with dullness.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

**The Place-names of Essex.** (English Place-name Society, Vol. XII.) By P. H. REANEY. Cambridge University Press. 1936. Pp. lxii+698. 25s. net.

THE author of this volume will be remembered for his article in *Englische Studien* (vol. 59, 321) on some features of the Essex dialect in Middle English. His book is planned in the same way as its forerunners, and is not unworthy of the series. There is the usual valuable introduction summarizing and co-ordinating the evidence of archæology and place-names for the early settlement of the county. The place-name material is fully and carefully discussed in the main body of the work; and the section on *Field and Minor Names* is especially ample.

The archæological finds in Essex are relatively scanty; but Mr. Reaney concludes that certain ancient place-names are to be assigned to the period between 450 and 500. These include *Vange*, which contains the ancient element *ge* "district," and a group bearing witness to the survival of pagan and primitive beliefs, e.g. *Thundersley*, *Weeley*, *Shackmore*, and *Nickersmadwe*. There are abundant names in *-ing* and some in *-ingaham*, though the latter are scarcer than in Kent or Sussex. The local distribution of certain rare elements, which are found only in counties adjacent to or near Essex, calls for notice. Examples are *bylc*, deduced from *Belchamp*, and

*scydd* in *Sheddon*. Essex has its quota, too, of elements that are either very rare or otherwise unknown in place-names; Mr. Reaney mentions *æled*, pp. "burned"; *cylu*, "spotted" (though it should be noted that this rests on a conjecture of Dr. A. H. Smith's regarding a single possible example, Kelvedon Hatch); *dylfen*, meaning something like "trench," "hollow in the ground," in *Delevyn's Farm*; *fær* "way, passage" as in *Laver* (which Mr. Reaney etymologizes as O.E. *lagufaer*); *māwe*, "meadow," in *Dunmow*, and *scoþ* in the conjectural sense "shed, lean-to building" in *Shopland*.

Cruces abound, of course (e.g. *Chingford*, *Wimbish*, *Baddow*, *Braintree*, *Rettendon*, *Rivenhall*, *Wendens Ambo*, *Ingrebourn*); and they have been wrestled with valiantly and often successfully. There are naturally many cases in which the interpretation offered by Mr. Reaney and the general editors differs from that of Professor Ekwall in his recent *Dictionary of English Place-Names*. But those of us who look on with interest at the operations of scholars in the difficult field of place-name etymology will not be shocked by the many differences of opinion on particular points: these are inevitable.

In his discussion of *Fingrith*, 237, Mr. Reaney appears either to have made a slight slip or to have left out a step in the explanation. He derives *Fingrith* from *Finingarith*, "the stream of the people of *Fin*," and speaks of "loss of medial *ing*." This last statement is difficult to understand, unless we are to assume that *-g-* has later been re-introduced into the modern form. Ekwall (s.v. *Fingringhoe*) prefers *fingerringhoe* as an etymology, and thinks that the use of the word *finger* might have been due to the smallness of the stream. Occasionally Professor Ekwall offers an earlier form than Mr. Reaney, as for *Mayland*, for which he adduces *Eiland*, 1181 (though without specifying his source), and which he etymologizes as *æt þæm eilande*; this is more convincing than Mr. Reaney's derivation from *mægþa*, "mayweed," which involves assuming that *-þ-* has been lost from all the recorded forms.

In references to sound-changes, there are occasionally incomplete or inaccurate statements. It is not adequate to say that "O.E. *ie* usually became *e* in M.E." (p. xxxvi); the *e*-type extended its scope and shouldered out the old W.S. form. Nor is it enough to state that "O.E. *e* (*æ*) before nasals became *a*" in Essex (p. xxxiv); this applies only in cases where *i*-mutation operated. On p. 196, apropos of the vowel in the first element of *Rochford*, Mr. Reaney refers to a statement by Ekwall that "a change from *a* to *o* occurs in East

Anglia at an early date," presumably with reference to forms such as *gofol* in *Maldon*, l. 61. The evidence for this is meagre, and it is by no means certain that a "change" operated. We may merely say that there seems to have been a tendency for *o* to become *a* occasionally *when followed by f*—not, as in the word *Mr. Reaney* is discussing, before *-ch*. See Luick, § 368. Further, it is inaccurate to speak of "intrusive *d* and ultimate loss of *s*" in *Madle* from O.F. *masle* "male" (p. 24). *-d-*, representing a pronunciation [ð], is regularly developed in Anglo-Norman from *z < s* before voiced dentals, instead of the *s* being assimilated to the following consonant as in Old French. Cf. Eng. *meddle*, French *meler* < O.F. *mesler*; and see M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, §§ 378, 1175, 1177. These are relatively unimportant errors, of course, as far as Mr. Reaney's own problems and results are concerned.

Mr. Reaney calls attention to one or two interesting phonological points: an inorganic *s* is developed initially before *c* in *Scaldhurst*, 180, and a puzzling development of initial *h* to *fr* is found in *Fremnells* < *Hemenales*. Voicing of initial *f* is quite common. Otherwise there is little that calls for comment in the phonology of Essex place-names.

Mr. Reaney's task in this book has been a considerable one, and he has done it conscientiously and thoroughly.

G. V. SMITHERS.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By MARGARET DOWLING

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Jahrgang 93, Band 174,  
Heft 1 u. 2—

Die Anfänge der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Phonetik in  
England (M. Lehnert), pp. 28-35.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 22, No. 2, October 1938—  
Anglo-Saxon Charters and the Historian (F. E. Harmer), pp. 339-67.  
A Parliamentary Debate of the Mid-Fifteenth Century (A. R. Myers),  
pp. 388-404.

The Development of Cobden's Economic Doctrines and his Methods  
of Propaganda : Some Unpublished Correspondence (E. Hughes),  
pp. 405-18.

The *Imitatio Christi* (E. F. Jacob), pp. 493-509.

The Bible and Mankind (E. Robertson), pp. 510-6.

ELH, Vol. V., No. 3, September 1938—

Scholarship and the Art of Criticism (L. Teeter), pp. 173-94.

" Rymes of . . . Randolph, Erl of Chestre " (J. W. Ashton), pp. 195-  
206.

Swift's Source of the Houyhnhnms reconsidered (D. E. Baughan),  
pp. 207-10.

Notes on the Life of John Dennis (F. S. Tupper), pp. 211-7.

Robert Southey and English Interest in the Near East (W. C. Brown),  
pp. 218-24.

The Influence of Milton and Wordsworth on the Early Victorian  
Sonnet (G. Sanderlin), pp. 225-51.

ETUDES ANGLAISES, No. IV, October-December 1938—

Les fins et les moyens d'Aldous Huxley (R. Lalou), pp. 353-71.

Lord Grey of Fallodon (L. Malmey), pp. 372-83.

A propos de quelques éditions récentes de Caxton (A. Koszul),  
pp. 384-7.

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. I., No. 4, July, 1938—

The Rise of an English Country Family (E. F. Gay), pp. 367-90.

Peter and John Temple, to 1603.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 123

William Percy : An Elizabethan Amateur (H. N. Hillebrand), pp. 391-416.

A Subject Analysis of English Imprints for Every Tenth Year from 1480 to 1640 (Edith L. Klotz), pp. 417-9.

John Brende : Soldier and Translator (H. Davis), pp. 421-6.

A Scotch Spenserian : Patrick Gordon (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 427-37.

John Evelyn and Colonel Herbert Morley in 1659-60 (A. H. Nethercot), pp. 439-46.

A Letter by Joseph Glanvill on the Future State (C. F. Mullett), pp. 447-56.

Correspondence of James Brydges and Robert Harley, Created Earl of Oxford (G. Davies and Marion Tinling), pp. 457-72.

Walpole's Marginalia in *Additions to Pope* (1776) (G. Sherburn), pp. 473-87.

## THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. II., No. 1, October 1938—

Richard Lee II, a Belated Elizabethan in Virginia (L. B. Wright), pp. 1-35.

Joel Barlow and Napoleon (L. Howard), pp. 37-51.

The Earliest English Reference to Rabelais's Work (O. J. Campbell), pp. 53-8.

The Two Versions of Settle's Frobisher Narrative (G. B. Parks), pp. 59-65.

Variant Editions of Settle's Account of Frobisher (R. Baughman), pp. 67-8.

Queen Elizabeth's Prayers (T. Brooke), pp. 69-77.

Edmund Spenser's Family (R. Heffner), pp. 79-84.

With a facsimile of the Spencer Pedigree in the Ellsmere MSS. in the Huntington Library.

Præmunire and Sir Edward Coke (S. E. Thorne), pp. 85-8.

Letters of Edward Young to Mrs. Judith Reynolds (H. T. Swedenberg, Jr.), pp. 89-100.

## LES LANGUES MODERNES, XXXVI<sup>e</sup> Année, No. 5, October-November 1938—

Milton (L. Chaffurin), pp. 441-7.

## LEUVENSCHÉ BIJDAGEN, Jaargang XXIX, Afl. 2, 3, 4—

Une Royale Curiosité Pédagogique (J. Gessler), pp. 41-58.

Un Essai théologico-stylistique du roi Edouard VI d'Angleterre.

## LIBRARY, Vol. XIX., No. 2, September 1938—

The Tours of Thomas Pennant (L. F. Powell), pp. 131-54.

The Library of Edward Gibbon (G. Keynes), p. 155.

A Piety of Printers (V. Scholderer), pp. 156-66.



- Some Types used by Paolo Manuzio (A. F. Johnson), pp. 167-75.  
 Thomas Dekker: Further Textual Notes (J. G. McManaway),  
 pp. 176-9.  
 A Fragment from Henslowe's Diary (W. W. Greg), pp. 180-4.  
 Rochester's *Poems on Several Occasions* (P. Gray), pp. 185-97.  
 Notes on Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary* (R. E. Metzdorf), pp. 198-201.  
 Some Early Bindings and Binders' Tools (G. D. Hobson), pp. 202-49.

MEDIUM AEVUM, Vol. VII, No. 3, October 1938—

- A Lollard tract: Ont ranslating the Bible into English (C. F. Bühler),  
 pp. 167-183.  
 Text reprinted.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXIII., No. 4, October 1938—

- The Hull Noah Play (Anna J. Mill), pp. 489-505.  
 Sir Philip Sidney and the Matchmakers (D. E. Baughan), pp. 506-19.  
 The Murder of Nicholas Turberville. Two Elizabethan Ballads  
 (Norma H. Hodgson), pp. 520-7.  
 Texts reprinted.  
 The Uses of the Term "Baroque" (J. Mark), pp. 547-63.  
 A Note on *Patience*, l. 54 (Mabel Day), p. 564.  
 Plays at Clerkenwell (W. O. Hassall), pp. 564-7.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang XXIV., Afl. 1—

- Engelsche zangwijzen bij Hollandsche Dichters. "Go from my  
 window" (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 54-62.  
 Four West Germanic Verbal Endings (C. E. Bazell), pp. 62-6.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 175, September 3—

- Parallel Passages (G. G. Loane), pp. 168-9.  
 Instances from several authors.  
 Keats and Cowper: A Reminiscence? (T. O. Mabbott), p. 170.  
 A similarity between lines of "When I have fears . . ." and the "Stanza  
 subjoined to the yearly bill of mortality . . ."

— September 10—

- The Crisis of *Paradise Regained* (G. G. L.), pp. 184-5.  
 Shakespeare in Modern Dress (W. W. Gill), pp. 186-7.  
*Macbeth* performed at Walworth in the mid-nineteenth century. See also  
 a note by A. H. Cooper-Prichard, October 8, pp. 265-6.

— September 17—

- A Possible new Source of Keats's Sonnet on Chapman's *Homer* (K. G.  
 Pfeiffer), pp. 203-4.  
 A poem by Jasper Mayne suggested. Reply by M. H. Dodds, October 1,  
 pp. 248-9.  
 Maria Edgeworth as a Social Novelist (M. Millhauser), pp. 204-5.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 175, September 24—

The Ashmolean Head of Oliver Cromwell (F. J. Varley), pp. 218-20.

Suggests the pedigree of the Ashmolean head establishes the fact that it came from Westminster Hall. See also note by F. W. Cock, October 15, p. 283.

Family Names from Old Documents (J. B. Wallis Chapman), pp. 221-3.

## October 1—

The English in St. Helena (G. C. Kitching), pp. 236-43.

Lists of names at varying dates.

Martha and Mary (G. G. L.), pp. 243-4.

## October 8—

Names from Monumental Inscriptions in St. Helena (G. C. Kitching), pp. 256-9.

Continued by V. H., October 22, p. 300.

An Autobiographical Note by Thomas Middleton (Mildred G. Christian), pp. 259-60.

Reference in *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*.

## October 15—

Addison's Purchase of Bilton Hall (W. Graham), pp. 272-3.

John Gibson Lockhart (A. L. Strout), pp. 275-9.

Estimate of Lockhart's character, based mainly on statements by various authors. See also October 22, pp. 290-4.

## October 22—

John Gibson Lockhart (A. L. Strout), pp. 290-4.

Text of twenty manuscript letters of Lockhart. Continued October 29, pp. 308-10 and December 3, pp. 399-404.

The Meaning of Poetry (G. G. L.) pp. 295-7.

## October 29—

Alexander D'Arblay (W. B. Gates), pp. 310-11.

His version of the *Te Deum*.

A. E. Housman and the *N.E.D.* (G. B. A. Fletcher), p. 312.

Omissions from the dictionary of words used by Housman.

## November 5—

Further Notes on the Young and Ottley Families (A. A.), pp. 326-330.

See also November 12, pp. 344-7.

Misprints in Chapman's *Homer* (G. G. Loane), pp. 231-2.

"Archangel" as a bird-name in Chaucer (D'A. W. Thompson), p. 332.

Godfrey, the 'Gof' of Hooke's Diary, 1688-93 (R. T. Gunther), p. 332.

## November 12—

*Twelfth Night*: "The Lady of the Strachy" (J. E. Morris), pp. 347-8

The Duchess of Suffolk suggested as the original.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, November 19—

The Family of Love (S. H. Atkins), pp. 362-4.

Description of this religious sect of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Shakespeare's Use of the *Arcadia* (Sara R. Watson), pp. 364-5.

An example in *Henry V*. Further note by J. E. Morris, December 3, p. 409.

Desainliens (W. B. Austin, T. P. Armstrong, W. Jaggard), pp. 371-2.  
Biographical and bibliographical notes.

## November 26—

Dekker's *Phaethon* (W. L. Halstead), pp. 380-5.

Lease of a London House and Shop, 1710 (H. Southam), pp. 385-6.

The Arm Akimbo as a Magical Posture (W. W. Gill), 386-7.

## December 3—

Milton and Valerius Flaccus (C. W. Brodribb), p. 399.

Evidence showing that Milton paid attention to the *Argonautica*.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
Vol. LIII, No. 3, September 1938—

Absolute Constructions in the Gothic Bible (M. Metlen), pp. 631-44.

The Runic Inscription of *Codex Latinus Monacensis* 13067 (C. Selmer),  
pp. 645-55.

An Interpretation of the A-Text of *Piers Plowman* (G. Winchester  
Stone, Jr.), pp. 656-77.

The Immediate Source of Euphuism (W. Ringler), pp. 678-86.

The Place of *I Henry VI* in the York-Lancaster Tetralogy (C. A.  
Greer), pp. 687-701.

Henry Lawes and Charles Cotton (Willa McC. Evans), pp. 724-9.

Lenten Casts and the Nursery: Evidence for the Dating of Certain  
Restoration Plays (P. H. Gray, Jr.), pp. 781-94.

The Friendship Theme in Orrery's Plays (L. J. Mills), pp. 795-806.

The Publication and Profits of Dryden's *Virgil* (Charles E. Ward),  
pp. 807-12.

Prose Fiction and English Interest in the Near East, 1775-1825 (W. C.  
Brown), pp. 827-36.

The Æsthetic Revolt against Naturalism in Victorian Criticism (C. R.  
Decker), pp. 844-56.

Meredith's Literary Theory and Science: Realism versus the Comic  
Spirit (E. A. Robinson), pp. 857-68.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXV., No. 4, October 1938—

Messire Oton de Graunson, Chaucer's Savoyard Friend (H. Braddy),  
pp. 515-31.

Rules and English Critics of the Epic, 1650-1800 (H. T. Swedenberg,  
Jr.), pp. 566-87.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 127

The Influence of the Popular Ballad on Wordsworth's Poetry (P. G. Brewster), pp. 588-612.

The Rajah Brooke and Joseph Conrad (J. D. Gordan), pp. 613-34.

Methods in Books about Swift (G. Sherburn), pp. 635-56.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, September 3—

"Present Discontents" (G. B. Harrison), p. 569.

A refusal to regard the future of English literature with gloom. Further letters by A. Lytton Sells and P. Gamble, September 10, pp. 583-4. See also J. Middleton Murry's letter "Thoughts on Reviewing," September 17, pp. 597-8; and letters by F. R. Leavis, M. Dodderidge, J. S. Alford, and Provincial, September 24, pp. 613-4.

The Coleridge Canon (L. Patton), p. 570.

Further letter by B. R. Davis, September 10, p. 585.

## — September 10—

Unpublished Letters (N. I. White), p. 584.

A note of various letters of literary interest in an unnoticed collection (Letters by Robert Burns, S. T. Coleridge, William Hazlitt, Charles Lamb).

## — September 17—

Chaucer's name (H. W. Davies), p. 598.

Suggested derivation.

## — October 1—

Letters of David Hume (W. G. MacLagan), p. 627.

Lockhart and Scott (W. M. Parker), p. 627.

Suggestions for work to be done on Scott.

"Tempered with Sighs" (A. P. Rice), pp. 627-8.

Suggested explanation.

## — October 8—

Lucy Countess of Bedford (P. Simpson), pp. 643-4.

Additional information.

Arme-Gaunt (B. H. Bronson), p. 644.

Suggested emendation for *Antony and Cleopatra*, I, v. 48. Reply by D. E. Yates, October 22, p. 678.

An unrecorded Work by Christopher Smart (E. G. Ainsworth, Jr.), p. 661.

The discovery of a copy of the music for the metrical versions of his Psalms. Reply by W. F. Stead, October 22, p. 677.

## — October 29—

Another Collier Forgery (W. Ringler), pp. 693-4.

*The ascription of Pleasant Quippes for Vpstart New fangled Gentlewomen* to Stephen Gosson.

A Spenser Allusion (G. F. Sensabaugh), p. 694.

## — November 5—

Works of Learned Ladies (S. G. Thomas), p. 709.

Information about the Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond (1443-1509).

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 12—

"Our Noisy Years" (E. de Selincourt), p. 725.

Suggested source of the phrase.

The Evangelical Magazine (J. Lindsay), p. 725.

Cowper's *Stanzas for the Northampton Bill of Mortality for 1792* first published there. Also an anticipation of Poe's *Israfel*.

A Brontë Metre (E. H. W. Meyerstein), pp. 725-6.

Comparison with Felicia Hemans's "Hour of Death". Letter on the same subject by A. Harbottle, November 26, p. 755.

## —December 3—

"The Worst of it" (H. C. Minchin), pp. 769-70.

Correction to a statement in *Unforgotten Years*, by Logan Pearsall Smith, concerning Louisa, Lady Ashburton.

## —December 10—

"I stood tip-toe" (C. D. Thorpe), pp. 785-6.

Comments on H. W. Garrod's letter of July 17, 1937.

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., No. 1, October, 1938—

Canadian Poetry—Past and Present (E. J. Pratt), pp. 1-10,

Proletarian Fiction in England (C. I. Glicksberg), pp. 41-55.

Mr. Eliot and some Enemies (E. K. Brown), pp. 69-84.

The Dialectical Humanism of Thomas Mann (A. F. B. Clark), pp. 85-105.

